FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-191
Wednesday
4 October 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-191 CONTENTS *4 October 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

17th Anniversary of ABM Treaty Noted 1
    Continued U.S. Compliance Urged *[Ptashnikov on Moscow Radio]* 1
    Treaty Praised, Explained *[TASS]* 1
Grinevskiy Cited on Vienna Arms Talks Proposals *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Sep]* 2
Petrov Discusses Imbalance of Chemical Weapons *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 2
'Enemies of Disarmament' Obstruct Accords *[Zhukov in PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 3
Disarmament Conference Ends in Hungary *[TASS]* 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Military Council Meets in Warsaw 5
    Opening Announced *[TASS]* 5
    Lushev Discusses Council's Role *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 5
Socialist Party Secretaries End Conference 5
    Results Discussed *[TASS]* 5
    Yakovlev Returns From Conference *[PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 6
CEMA States' Labor Organ Leaders Meet *[TRUD 26 Sep]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Addresses Foreign Policy Association *[IZVESTIYA 4 Oct]* 7
TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 3 Oct 13
    Bhutto's Remarks on Afghanistan 13
    Vietnamese Withdrawal 13
    Summary of Briefing 14
NATO 'Obstructing' Indian Ocean Conference *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 14
Aviation Conference Discusses Air Safety *[PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 16
Shevardnadze's UN Speech Published in Pamphlet *[TASS]* 16

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Yazov's Visit to U.S. 17
    Meets Powell; Tours Pentagon, City *[Moscow TV]* 17
    Meets Bush, Leaves for New York 17
    Further on Moscow Send-off for Yazov *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 18
Shevardnadze Departs U.S. for Nicaragua, Cuba *[TASS]* 18
Washington Scene Viewed as Congress Resumes *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 18

China

PRC Leaders Send Anniversary Message to USSR *[PRAVDA 3 Oct]* 20
Deng Xiaoping Assessment of Summer Riots Cited *[PRAVDA 3 Oct]* 20
GDR-Bound PRC Delegation Stops Over in Moscow *[PRAVDA 3 Oct]* 20
Gorkiy Automobile Plant Marketing PRC Goods *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 21

Northeast Asia

Razumovskiy Receives Chingel, Mongolian Delegation *[PRAVDA 1 Oct]* 21
Commentary Views Thatcher's Visit to Japan *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* 21

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Quayle's Visit Seen as U.S. Pressure on Bases *[Aleksandrov on Moscow International]* 22
Valentinov Analyzes Thai Stance on Cambodia *[Moscow International]* 22
Commentator on Likelihood of Cambodian Civil War *[(Shchebrov) on Moscow International]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Response to Mideast Peace Moves Urged *[Balebanov on TASS]* 24
Arab Challenge Causes More Mideast 'Polarization' *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 24
Gorbachev Adviser Zagladin on Peace Process *[Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ 3 Oct]* 25
Official Says Afghan War 'Blunder,' 'Not Wise' *[Tehran IRNA]* 26
Committee Continues Work To Release POW's *[TASS]* 26
Tehran Seminar on Afghanistan Viewed *[Sheftunov on Moscow International]* 27
Expectations for UN Iran-Iraq Peace Plan Viewed *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 27
Kuwait's Relations With Iran, Shiites Viewed *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 28
Shevardnadze Meets Counterparts in New York *[TASS]* 28
Pallayev Delegation Meets Moroccan Party Leader *[IZVESTIYA 1 Oct]* 29
  Received by Parliament Members *[TASS]* 29
Demands of Sudan's 'Southern Fighters' Viewed *[Ivanov on Moscow International]* 30
Indian Ambassador Received at Foreign Ministry *[IZVESTIYA 24 Sep]* 30

Sub-Saharan Africa

TASS Notes Cuban Withdrawal From Angola 30
Angola Says Cuban Withdrawal May Be Suspended *[TASS]* 31
Angolan Peace Plans Like 'House of Cards' *[Petrovskiy on Moscow International]* 31
Kenyan Diplomat Holds Talks With Adamishin *[Moscow International]* 31

East Europe

Migrants 'Dazzled' by West, Ignore GDR Successes *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 32
GDR's Neubauer Protests FRG 'Gross Violation' *[TASS]* 32
ADN Commentary on Refugees, Life in the West *[TASS]* 32
Moscow Radio on GDR Refugees, Bonn's Role 33
Soviet Warships To Visit East Germany 5-9 Oct *[TASS]* 34
Poland's Mazowiecki Thanks Rykhkov for Message *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 34
Rakowski Call for Polish Party Unity Noted *[PRAVDA 29 Sep]* 34
Rakowski Queried, Says 'Gradual' Reforms Required *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* 34
Market Switch Seen Causing Polish Inflation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Sep]* 35
Poland Awaiting Political, Economic Upturn *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 35
Solidarity Action Against PZPR Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 36
Adam Michnik Interviewed on Polish Changes *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 37
Polish Government Keeps Mum on Anti-USSR Demos *[TRUD 29 Sep]* 41
Poles Urged To Forget 'Ancient Grievances' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 42
USSR, Polish Historians Discuss World War II *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 43
Hungary's Grosz Assesses Party Developments *[Moscow TV]* 43
Yazov Sends Greetings to Hungary's Karpati *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Sep]* 44
Hungary's MSZMP Party Plenum Concludes 25 Sep 44
  Topics of Discussion Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* 44
  Program Debates Reported *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 44
  Differing Views of Party's Future *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 45
  Pre-Congress 'Struggle' in Party *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Sep]* 45
Dispute Over Slovenian Constitution Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* 46

West Europe

Falin, FRG's Bahr Preside Over Working Groups *[TASS]* 47
Falin Discusses GDR Refugees During Bonn Visit *[Hamburg DPA]* 47
FRG Warships To Visit Leningrad Mid-October *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Sep]* 47
Zagladin in France on 'Delays' in Perestroyka *[Paris Radio]* 48

Finn Cited on Balts' Need To Remember Nazi Aims *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 48
Finnish Communist Cited on Estonian Nationalism *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Sep]* 48
Lukyanov, Finland's Sorsa Discuss Cooperation *[TASS]* 49
Lukyanov Receives Danish Ambassador's Credentials *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 49
Brutents Leaves for UK Labour Party Forum *[PRAVDA 1 Oct]* 49

Latin America & Caribbean

Shevardnadze Arrives in Managua for Working Visit 49
  Met at Airport by Ortega *[TASS]* 49
  Makes Statement Upon Arrival *[TASS]* 49
Commentary Examines Nicaragua's 'Flexible' Policy *[Mayorov on Moscow International]* 50
Attempt To Topple Panama's Noriega Fails 3 Oct 50
  TASS Reports Military Uprising 50
  Reports of U.S. Support Cited *[TASS]* 51
  Panama TV Reports Rebels' Surrender *[TASS]* 51
  Noriega, in Control, Appears on TV *[TASS]* 52

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Akhromeyev Addresses Supreme Soviet on Amnesty *[Moscow TV]* 53
Comparison of Sukharev Remarks on Amnesty *[Moscow TV]* 53
Ryzhkov's Speech to Supreme Soviet 2 Oct *[PRAVDA 3 Oct]* 54
  Ryzhkov Answers Questions *[Moscow TV]* 67
Moscow Radio on 3 Oct Supreme Soviet Proceedings 68
  1502 GMT 68
  1550 GMT 69
  1635 GMT 69
  1754 GMT 70
Further Reportage on 3 Oct Supreme Soviet Session 70
  'Heated Debates' Held *[Moscow Radio]* 70
  Draft Strike Law Discussed *[TASS]* 71
  Resolution on Action To Normalize Railways *[TASS]* 71
  Ryzhkov Reads Transcaucasus Draft *[Moscow Radio]* 72
  Further on Railroad Operation *[Moscow TV]* 73
  Rail Transport Discussed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 4 Oct]* 74
  Decision on Transportation, Strikes Adopted *[TASS]* 75
  Proceedings Reviewed *[TASS]* 75
Committees, Commissions Agenda for 4 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* 75
  'Intensive' Work Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Voronin, Konarev, Zaykov Discuss Railroad Problems *[TRUD 4 Oct]* 76

Political & Social

Further Reportage on Nagorno-Karabakh Blockade 77
  Interior Ministry Troops To Increase *[TASS]* 77
  Subcommission Head on Railroad Crisis *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* 77
  Situation in Armenia, Azerbaijan Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 78
  Alarm Voiced at Rail Traffic Disruption *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 79
  'Immediate Measures' Called for *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 21 Sep]* 80
  Yerevan Official on Military Exercise, Blockade *[Yerevan International]* 80
Further on Winter Plans for Armenian Quake Zone *[PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 81
Deputy Editor Views Yeltsin U.S. Visit Coverage
Miners Hold 2-Hour Strike in Ukraine *[AFP]* 81
Leadership Criticized at Moldavian Party Plenum *[PRAVDA 4 Oct]* 82
Ukrainians Demonstrate Against 'Police Brutality' *[AFP]* 84
Comparison of Gorbachev Ukrainian Plenum Speech *[PRAVDA 29 Sep]* 85
Ligachev Calls for Party Unity *[SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 10 Sep]* 86
Sakharov Interviewed on Nationalities, Gorbachev *[Paris LE MONDE 30 Sep]* 88

CPSU Secretary Stroyev Views Nationality Plenum *[Sofia POGLED No 39]* 90
CPSU Plenum Speech by Latvia's Vagris Published *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 23 Sep]* 91
More on Vezirov CPSU Plenum Speech *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 23 Sep]* 93
Commission Reviews Effect of Perestroyka on Press *[TASS]* 95
'Naive' Hope of U.S. Aid for Perestroyka Derided *[KOMSOMOLOSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 96
Third Alternative Latvian Constitution Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* 98
Communists Seen Leading Change in Estonia *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* 98
Estonian Front Leader Urges Renunciation of Pact *[REEDE 1 Sep]* 100
KGB Responds to Report on Border Drug Traffic *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 101
KGB Official on Chelyabinsk Stalinist Repressions *[Moscow TV]* 101
New Orel Obkom Secretary Selected *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* 102
Aircraft Bomb Hoaxer To Face Trial *[IZVESTIYA 30 Sep]* 102

Economic

Defense Plants Seen Resisting Conversion *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 21 Sep]* 102
State Civilian Conversion Plan Discussed
[Komarov in PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No. 18] 104

Military

Akhromeyev Says Arms Spending Cuts Necessary *[TASS]* 106
KGB Cuts Central Military Counterintelligence *[TASS]* 106
Reorganization of Komsomol Army Structure Proposed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Oct]* 107

17th Anniversary of ABM Treaty Noted

Continued U.S. Compliance Urged

LD0410102489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Today marks the 17th anniversary of the coming into force of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems, the ABM treaty for short. My colleague, Andrey Ptashnikov will talk on this treaty in more detail:

[Ptashnikov] If we are to talk of the signicifance of the ABM treaty then, today, just as 17 years ago, it is difficult to overrate. For the very preamble to the treaty says, said, I quote: Effective measures to limit antiballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms, and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons; and such measures have been taken by both sides, especially actively in the first years after the treaty came into effect. For both the United States and the USSR understood very well that, by limiting their ABM systems, they thereby strengthened the defense of their countries' territory. There is nothing paradoxical in this, since each country realized that its first nuclear strike against the enemy would quickly provoke retaliation, maybe not as great, but enough to inflict colossal, irreparable damage.

In other words, there existed the mutual understanding that there can be no victor in a nuclear war. All of this lasted until the Strategic Defense Initiative program was born and began to be implemented in the United States. Its creation clearly broke the conditions of the ABM treaty. For this reason the White House and the Pentagon came to dislike the treaty, and they actively sought its collapse. Thus, in particular, the concept of a broad interpretation of the ABM treaty and limiting of its period of validity appeared. And yet the treaty, I will remind you, has no expiration date.

Such attacks on it did not end until the most recent period. It is not so long ago that U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney, for example, announced candidly that he would work for the renunciation of the ABM treaty as soon as the United States was ready to begin deploying SDI. This program was the basic stumbling block at the negotiations going on just now between the USSR and the United States on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms—SOA, for short. It is only thanks to the new constructive approach of our country that the possibility to overcome this obstacle has appeared.

I have in mind the readiness, expressed by the USSR, to sign the agreement on strategic offensive arms even if no accord has been reached by then on weapons in space. I remind you that this proposal was made by USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze during his recent meeting with U.S. Secretary of State Baker. This is not a concession on our part, since the proposal stipulates the necessity of continued observance of the ABM treaty. Moreover, with the aim of strengthening the conditions of the treaty, our country has decided to completely dismantle the Krasnoyarsk radar station. At the same time, the hope was expressed that the United States would take reciprocal steps in relation to similar stations of theirs in Greenland and Great Britain.

And so the ABM treaty is still in effect, and the Soviet Union is doing everything possible for its preservation. As far as the United States is concerned, then it remains to be hoped that in their approach to this most important document, realism and new thinking will ultimately prevail.

Treaty Praised, Explained

LD0310225189 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—A Soviet diplomat said the ABM treaty has been and remains the foundation for strategic stability in relations between the USSR and the U.S.A. and in the world.

In an interview with TASS on the 17th anniversary of the ABM treaty, Vitaliy Lukyantsev, senior adviser of the Directorate for Arms Limitation and Disarmament of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said the viability of the treaty has been confirmed by the period of time that passed since it came into effect.

"Recognising the organic link between strategic offensive and defensive arms, the USSR and the U.S.A. have established the only correct formula to determine the course of talks on control of strategic nuclear arms", Lukyantsev said.

The essence of the ABM treaty is mutual renunciation of the creation of an anti-ballistic missile system on the country's territory, the Soviet expert noted. Under the treaty, each party undertakes not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based.

The absence of a full-scale ABM system makes a potential aggressor vulnerable to a retaliatory nuclear strike and, consequently, promotes the consolidation of strategic stability, Lukyantsev said.

Both sides have been adhering to the ABM treaty for a long time, Lukyantsev said, "But in the recent years the issue of an anti-ballistic missile system has become very sensitive, above all, because the U.S. is striving to interpret the agreement in a way that would enable it, in violation of the ABM treaty, to embark on the creation of large-scale defences—the SDI programme", he said.

"Despite the agreement reached in Washington in December 1987 to observe the ABM treaty as signed in 1972 and keep within the treaty for a specified period of time, a deadlock actually developed at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms."

"The United States interpreted the Washington formula as an opportunity to reach agreement on a new treaty supplanting the ABM treaty to which the USSR, naturally, could not consent. Each side had a number of other concerns connected with the observance of the ABM treaty".

An important breakthrough in the solution of this problem was reached during the latest meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming, where both sides showed goodwill and readiness for mutually acceptable compromise.

Guided by its long-standing goal of consolidating the regime of the ABM treaty, the USSR expressed readiness to liquidate the Krasnoyarsk radar station. The U.S. side promised to discuss with its allies Soviet concerns over large U.S. phased-array radars in Greenland and Great Britain.

Of no less importance is the Soviet proposal for differentiation between the activity that is permitted and prohibited under the ABM treaty. It was also significant that the two countries agreed to discuss in Geneva the U.S. invitation for Soviet Government experts to visit the U.S. facilities where strategic defence research is conducted.

Lukyantsev believes that one of the main achievements at Wyoming was the Soviet proposal allowing an agreement on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive arms to be signed, even if an arrangement on space arms is not reached by that time.

"However, the sides should continue to observe the ABM treaty. This is our stand of principle", Lukyantsev said in conclusion.

Grinevskiy Cited on Vienna Arms Talks Proposals

PM0310141389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "New Proposals Submitted"]

[Text] Vienna, 28 Sep—To accelerate the pace of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe and clear the way to reaching the soonest accord there—these are the main aims of the Warsaw Pact states' new proposals for limiting front-line (tactical) combat aircraft and combat helicopters. They were officially submitted on behalf of the Warsaw Pact Organization by the GDR delegation at a plenary session of the forum. Ambassador K.D. Ernst, the delegation head, declared that the new working document is designed to help resolve one of the most important disputed issues, and to remove a considerable obstacle which is hampering progress at the talks.

The socialist countries now propose including in the subject of the talks all front-line (tactical) aircraft—bombers, fighter-bombers, ground-attack aircraft, and front-line fighters, as well as reconnaissance aircraft and electronic warfare aircraft, establishing a ceiling of 4,700 units for each of the alliances. This level does not include air defense aircraft, since they do not have the ability to make strikes against ground targets and are not part of the surprise attack potential. These aircraft have typical external signs which make it possible to distinguish them from combat aircraft both outwardly and by their arms and equipment.

We are ready, O.A. Grinevskiy, ambassador for special assignments and head of the Soviet delegation, said in a conversation with a TASS correspondent in this connection, to accord Western specialists the opportunity to see this for themselves. Particularly with the help of on-site verification and corresponding notification. At the same time inspectors would be granted the right of free access to aircraft and to inspect them, including arms systems. In the interests of a compromise we could also undertake to establish a definite level for such air defense aircraft on condition that the means which these aircraft are designed to combat are not built up, he pointed out. As regards combat helicopters, the Warsaw Pact agrees to an upper limit of 1,900 units for each of the alliances. Thus, the positions on this question now coincide.

The proposals submitted, O.A. Grinevskiy emphasized at a news conference, attest that the Warsaw Pact estimates at its true worth NATO's agreement, contained in their proposals of 13 June this year, to undertake a reduction in combat aircraft and helicopters. This was an important step toward the Warsaw Pact position. Our new proposals constitute a constructive response to our partners in the talks.

In order to complete the Vienna talks during 1990, as both the Warsaw Pact and NATO advocate, the Soviet delegation head continued, a kind of strategy for their acceleration is needed. We have suggested to the United States and the NATO countries holding a top-level conference in the second half of 1990 to sign an agreement on conventional armed forces, which could be attended by leaders of European states. It would be an all-European conference on an unprecedented scale. For the purpose of preparing for it, a meeting of foreign ministers could be held in Vienna at the beginning of next year to resolve the most complex problems at the talks.

Petrov Discusses Imbalance of Chemical Weapons

LD0310161789 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1148 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Zagreb, Oct 3 (TANJUG)—There is suspicion about the U.S. Intention of stopping production and commencing destrution of its chemical weapons because the United States has adopted a programme of modernisation of this type of weapon, especially binary poisons, Stanislav Petrov, until-recently commander of the Soviet chemnical units, said in an exclusive interview with the Zagreb weekly DANAS.

Perceptive political observers considering these statements by the two ministers emphasize that there is no time to lose in making a fresh start, in view of the real situation which is not as simple as it may appear at first glance.

What specifically is at issue?

The U.S. press writes frankly that the right wing of the ruling Republican Party, whose members refuse even to hear, for instance, of a substantial reduction or elimination of nuclear weapons, still has strong influence. On the other hand, one cannot fail to consider the fact that the movement of public forces in favor of disarmament has now slackened off—many people have ceased to believe in the threat of war. Yet the mountains of stockpiled weapons are still virtually untouched. Only intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles are being destroyed.

In these conditions the incumbent U.S. administration preferred to hang fire until recently, walking a tightrope between those who demanded the more rapid resumption of talks on reductions in strategic offensive arms and those who refused to hear of this. Once the USSR proposed fresh solutions opening the way to the conclusion of a treaty, the U.S. president and his secretary of state took up a constructive stance. Whereupon other voices could be heard.

Defense Secretary R. Cheney, for instance, speaking in San Francisco, said that the "USSR is still the United States' main military adversary." He demanded the continuation of large-scale programs to create new strategic defense systems. While in turn U.S. Vice President D. Quayle, visiting Tokyo, said insistently during a conversation with Japan's prime minister: "We are still faced with a power capable of destroying the United States and everything we believe in.... It is still too early for us to pass judgment regarding a substantial reduction in our own strategic potential or military expenditure."

Then R. Cheney in turn continued to kindle doubts regarding the advisability of accords with the USSR on arms reductions. He presented journalists 27 September with the eighth edition of the Pentagon's review "Soviet Military Power," to which he himself wrote the preface. In it R. Cheney stated that "Soviet military capabilities" pose a "major threat" to the United States. Speaking to journalists, he now went even further, proclaiming that the USSR is the "only country still capable of threatening the survival of the United States."

I am not speaking about the U.S. generals and admirals who are clearly scared by the prospect of a U.S.-USSR accord on arms reduction and are now literally dying to counterattack. Admiral Carlisle Trost, chief of U.S. Naval Operations, for instance, said at a meeting of military contractors: "Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's peace initiatives may in fact be a trick (?!). The United States and its NATO allies could find themselves in weak positions as a result." "Their proposals," the admiral stressed, "are a direct threat to our potential."

You are simply amazed when you read all these deliberately dramatized statements. D. Quayle, R. Cheney, and C. Trost never tire of repeating that the USSR has enough arms to destroy the United States. But are they really unaware that the United States has enough arms to destroy the USSR? Or that substantial arms reductions on both sides were discussed at the talks, whereby they would be left with an equal quantity of weapons sufficient for defense but not for aggression? If the present quantity of arms alarms them, why are they afraid of accords to reduce these weapons?

Well, it is a familiar story. This has happened every time that there was an opportunity for the development of U.S.-Soviet cooperation. Such campaigns waged by the enemies of disarmament have frequently wrecked existing accords. In other cases common sense has prevailed—let us recall the victory won by U.S. President R. Reagan and his supporters over the eternal doubters when the question of the ratification and implementation of the treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles was resolved.

Everything will now depend on how consistently and doggedly the incumbent administration's leadership continues what was begun in Washington and Jackson. It will not be up to the Soviet Union.

The U.S. secretary of state is right: Now more than ever it is important to maintain the momentum and advance more rapidly on the basis of the accords secured in Jackson and Washington.

Disarmament Conference Ends in Hungary

LD0110105789 Moscow TASS in English 1002 GMT 1 Oct 89

[Text] Budapest October 1 TASS—An enlarged conference of experts from several European parties on disarmament ended its deliberations here. Apart from its direct sponsors—the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Finnish Social Democratic Party and the Italian Socialist Party,—the current 3rd conference was attended by representatives from various organisations of Poland and West Germany and experts from other parties. The eventual aim of their activities is to reach an inter-state agreement on nuclear disarmament.

Rezso Nyers, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, who addressed the forum, pointed to the importance of increasing the number of its participants. Speaking about the contribution of European parties to strengthening peace and security, he noted that, joining the disarmament dialogue, the inter-party conference increased the number of issues discussed by Warsaw Treaty and NATO experts.

The inter-party conference was also addressed by K. Sorsa, speaker of the Finnish parliament, and P. Vittoreli, representative of the Italian Socialist Party. Conference participants were informed of urgent issues of Hungary's domestic life and met representatives of the opposition roundtable.

Petrov said there was now a danger of the current relative balance in chemical weapons between the big powers being disturbed because the Soviet Union has stopped producing these weapons.

Commenting on the recent statement by the U.S. President at the session of the U.N. General Assembly that his country was ready to destroy all its chemical weapons stockpiles, Petrov recalled that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev had said as far back as the beginning of 1986 that the total liquidation of chemical weapons by the end of the century was an absolutely realistic task.

The Soviet Union is already constructing facilities for the destruction of its chemical weapons stocks amounting to (?50,000) tonnes, Petrov said.

He denied a chemical weapons incident, reported by the Western press, at Sverdlovsk a few years ago. He pointed out that the technology for the destruction of chemical weapons had been tested for years and been shown to particpants in the disarmament talks in Geneva in 1987.

Petrov said that the deficiency of current international agreement on chemical weapons lied in lack of production control systems.

The Soviet Union sets great store by a planned international conference in Australia aiming to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons, he said.

Petrov stressed that the Soviet Union had used no chemical weapons in Afghanistan whereas the Mujaheddin (?used) U.S.-made chemical hand grenades and special water-poisoning pills but only against the Afghan army.

'Enemies of Disarmament' Obstruct Accords

PM0310132189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 89 Second Edition p 6

[Yuriy Zhukov commentary under the "View from Moscow" rubric: "Present Momentum Must Be Maintained"]

[Text] It has been the custom from time immemorial: In late September and early October people expect news from across the ocean. According to established tradition the UN General Assembly, attended by leaders from all countries, opens in New York on the third Tuesday in September. The assembly discusses most important world problems, and there are at the same time high-level bilateral talks, inter alia Soviet-U.S. talks.

This news coming from the United States is in particularly full flood. Accords were reached at the meeting between the heads of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments in Jackson (Wyoming), opening up the way to the resolution of most important international problems and questions of Soviet-U.S. relations. On Monday 25 September the world learned of the interesting new ideas which the U.S. President submitted at the UN General Assembly session. The following day our foreign minister announced new Soviet initiatives.

This profusion of agreements, accords, and new proposals, which open the way to profound changes for the better in international affairs and U.S.-USSR bilateral relations, is natural. It is the result of tremendous, incredibly hard, but fruitful work on both sides, beginning with the memorable summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985. The impending summit talks which will, under an accord now reached, be held in approximately late spring to early summer next year can and should culminate in impressive results.

Speaking at the UN General Assembly session, our foreign minister said that it may be quite possible to conclude a treaty on strategic arms reductions by the time of the Soviet-U.S. summit which will be held in approximately late spring to early summer 1990. "Do you agree with that assessment?" U.S. journalists asked the U.S. president 27 September. They received the following answer: "Yes, I do."

People in the Kremlin and in the White House believe that protocols will be signed at the summit to the 1974 and 1976 Treaties on Nuclear Tests and on Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, which have not hitherto been ratified. There can be no doubt that this meeting will probably advance the talks currently under way in a constructive spirit between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries on major reductions in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

Last, it is also important to note that the Soviet-U.S. talks in Washington and Jackson and the subsequent statements made by the U.S. president and the leader of the USSR foreign policy department at the UN General Assembly session have opened up the way for the elimination of chemical weapons.

But that is by no means all. I am deliberately not mentioning the agreements and accords reached in the course of the talks on other extremely important problems—the settlement of regional conflicts, humanitarian problems, a whole series of questions of bilateral relations, cooperation in the struggle against the spread of drugs and against international terrorism, and so on. These are topics of special discussion.

However, it must be stressed that both sides still have a great deal of work to do before the upcoming summit in order to ensure that these accords are translated into the precise and clear language of draft treaties and protocols.

Both ministers are perfectly well aware of this, and it is no coincidence that their voices sounded in unison at their press conferences at the close of the talks in Jackson: **It is time to switch from mutual understanding on radical problems to collaboration in order to resolve them.**

"We have done great work," J. Baker stressed. **"We do not want to lose the momentum. And we won't!"**

Warsaw Pact Military Council Meets in Warsaw

Opening Announced

LD0310210789 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Warsaw October 3 TASS—A regular meeting of the Military Council of the Warsaw Treaty united armed forces opened here today. It is discussing the training of the armies and navies that form the united armed forces, as well as tasks for the coming year in this field.

The meeting was chaired by Army General Petr Lushev, commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Treaty united armed forces, and is attended by Military Council members and representatives of the staff of the Warsaw Treaty united armed forces and of allied armies.

The opening session was attended by Army General Florian Siwicki, Polish defence minister.

Later in the day meeting participants laid wreaths at the tomb of the unknown soldier in the Victory Square and at the cemetery of Soviet soldiers in Warsaw.

Lushev Discusses Council's Role

PM0310151589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Army General P.G. Lushev by unnamed TASS correspondent: "For an Exchange of Experience"—date and place not specified]

[Text] A session of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces military council will be held in Warsaw 3-5 October. Army General P.G. Lushev, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces, describes the military council's activity to your TASS correspondent.

"The structure of the Warsaw Pact's military organs was defined by a decision of the allied states at a Political Consultative Committee conference in spring 1969 in view of the fact that the international situation in the sixties was complex and contradictory. That structure included the defense ministers' committee, the joint command, the military council, the staff, and the technical committee.

"The military council, created in the interests of the all-around examination of questions of the state and development of the Joint Armed Forces, has been directing its main efforts throughout its 20-year existence to the full and qualitative fulfillment of the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee and the defense ministers committee on improving the readiness of the Joint Armed Forces and the armed defense of the Warsaw Pact states, the development of all-around military cooperation, and the strengthening of the international cohesion and fraternity in arms of the allied armies.

"Its activity is based on the improvement of the quality of the operational and combat training of troops and fleet forces, the organizational structure and technical equipment of formations and units of branches of armed forces and categories of troops, and the improvement of administration. The fall sessions of the military council discuss the results of the training of the Joint Armed Forces in the past year and determine the tasks for troops and fleet forces for the following training year.

"Recent years have demanded particularly intensive work from the military council. This is due primarily to the fact that considerable measures are being implemented in the allied armies to reduce armaments and armed forces in accordance with the defensive military doctrine. I think that the forthcoming session of the military council will adopt decisions which help to strengthen the combat readiness of the allied states' armies."

Socialist Party Secretaries End Conference

Results Discussed

LD2809221189 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Varna September 28 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Stepanenko:

Secretaries of the Central Committees of the fraternal parties of socialist countries concluded a conference on international affairs here today.

The conference was attended by representatives of the communist and workers' parties from Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, Korea, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

The conference was also attended by the head of the International Relations Department of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the editor-in-chief of the magazine "WORLD MARXIST REVIEW".

Participants exchanged opinions of the present world situation and issues of concern for the parties in their international activites.

Evaluating the results of the conference, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party Aleksandr Yakovlev told TASS that the conference discussed two major questions of special importance both from the point of view of actual policies pursued by the fraternal parties and states in the modern world and from the point of view of the theory of scientific socialism.

One of the two questions concerned the position of socialism in the world and the situation in the socialist world, viewed in their inter-relation.

The significance of this problem is obvious, he said. It concerns theory and practice, ideology and politics, the economy and the military situation.

To sort out their complex interconnections, single out the chief objective tendencies in their development and to realistically assess one's own interests and capabilities in this context means to stimulate one's own development.

There is yet another aspect to this tight knot of problems: The socialist doctrine arose from an analysis of the latest contemporary experience of the work developments and it can further evolve only by moving along the same path while retaining its specific quality.

The second question under discussion at the conference, related to the European process and its perspectives.

Yakovlev drew a parallel between the idea of a common European home at its present phase, which needs further elaboration and specification of details and particulars, with the idea of a universal and complete disarmament put forward in Genoa in 1922.

"We have fought to implement that idea for a long time," Yakovlev said. "Now, after more than half a century, it begins to yield results. One can only wish to live to see the idea of the common European home realized before another fifty years elapse.

"What that common European home will be like depends on us too," Yakovlev stressed. He said that the meeting, the deliberations, the ideas voiced in discussions, the materials and the thoughts secretaries exchanged—all deserved close examination and further "homework", including analysis and evaluation of what has been accomplished.

"At the conference that has just concluded," Yakovlev went on to say, "we understood that the words 'unity' and 'uniformity' have a grammatical affinity but differ radically in their political meaning.

"True unity is only effective when it is based on diversity, when each participant of a joint action has been motivated to join in by his own interests and requirements, as a result of his own free choice.

"Diversity is the most badly needed remedy against dogmatism and against stereotyped thoughts and actions.

"We must seek to preserve in future the freedom of utterance and open discussion which manifested iteself at the present conference," Yakovlev said.

"This is bound to make our political decisions better argumented, deeper thought out and, consequently, more effective," he stressed.

"Conferences like this one," Yakovlev noted, "clearly attest to the role played by our parties. The fraternal parties act as a consolidating force and a political vanguard not only in their own homelands but also within the confines of the socialist community and the socialist world as a whole.

"We shall remain in the vanguard only if we are able to recognise and identify, before others, new phenomena and processes, both domestic and international," Yakovlev pointed out.

Yakovlev Returns From Conference

PM0310095189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Return to Moscow"]

[Text] A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, returned to Moscow from Varna 29 September. He had been taking part in the conference of secretaries of the central committees of the socialist countries' fraternal parties on international issues.

CEMA States' Labor Organ Leaders Meet

18070349 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Sep 89 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent L. Platonov in Havana dated 25 September: "Coordination of Efforts"]

[Text] The first meeting of the leaders of state labor organs of CEMA member countries ended recently in the Cuban capital.

Commenting on its results in an interview with our correspondent, V.I. Shcherbakov, head of the Soviet delegation and chairman of the USSR Goskomtrud [State Committee for Labor and Social Problems], noted that all the participants unanimously supported an increase in the effectiveness of the socialist countries' cooperation in the area of labor, and therefore a coordination plan of activity was adopted for the next 3 years. "The old forms are no longer effective," he said. "Therefore, we have come out with new proposals. Here in Havana we agreed to establish several joint enterprises in the system of labor organs. They will engage in scientific and consultative activity. It was also decided to conduct a comprehensive analysis of all labor norms, and to unify job appointments, professional skills reference books, and tariff systems. All of this is necessary to begin preparation for free immigration of the labor force within CEMA."

What is happening today? Let us take the Ivanovskoye association for the processing and production of complex machine tools with digital programming control. Besides our country, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria are participating in the activity of this joint enterprise. People work in one collective, but the salaries, labor standards, and working hours are different for representatives of each country. This should not be. In the near future we will have to find methods and resolutions for all of these problems, V.I. Shcherbakov emphasized.

Shevardnadze Addresses Foreign Policy Association

PM0410104189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report entitled "On the Past and the Present. Speech by E.A. Shevardnadze at New York's Foreign Policy Association"]

[Text] October 3 TASS—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, spoke at New York's Foreign Policy Association Monday evening. He said:

Esteemed Mr Chairman!
Esteemed members of the executive committee!
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have been told that the Foreign Policy Association was established soon after the revolution in Russia and that it was due to the Americans' rapidly growing interest in international affairs.

If this is so, then our meeting acquires a special dimension since it is taking place at a time when the United States is following closely the revolutionary developments in the Soviet Union.

Perestroyka means our opening to the world and also our discovery of the world.

As I see it, our discussion today not only gives me an opportunity to say something to you but is also a chance for me to hear and understand a number of things.

I would like to speak about my country and the world we live in.

I believe that today their destinies are intertwined as never before.

Hence the keen interest in what is happening in the Soviet Union, in how we address our problems and whether we are capable of solving them at all.

There are many people in your country who have doubts in this regard. Pessimism is growing. This is understandable because the state of the Soviet economy and some developments in our country do give rise to concern.

However, national economy, especially the economy of a country as vast as ours, is a living and complex, I would even say nervous, organism. At a time when it is going through a readjustment, its health cannot be measured by statistics or some other objective indicators alone. And forecasting, in my view, is a task not only for economists but also for social psychologists and politicians. As long as there is the will, the understanding of the situation, and the determination to change things for the better—and we certainly have them—the economy can remedy its ills. This is true of any economy, and doubly true of the Soviet economy, given its potential and resources.

In other respects, the movement is generally following the direction set by perestroyka. Perhaps its pace is faster than expected. There is some "overheating" in political activity, but that has been generated by the processes of renewal and democratization of public life. This does create problems, but in our situation a slower pace would probably create even bigger problems.

I do not want to oversimplify the situation, but nor should it be overdramatized. Unfortunately, there is a lot of sensationalism in writings about perestroyka. Indeed, there are some sensations, but they are probably not the most important part of what is happening.

I am sure that in a few years from now, recalling perestroyka's arduous path, people will be saying that "toward the end of 1989 serious misgivings arouse about its future." So perhaps it would be a good idea for me to speak here again in two or three years to discuss with you the past and the future.

Today, too, permit me to begin with the past. Let me recall historical precedents and draw some parallels between, for example, the current situation in our economy and the great American depression.

In 1929, a powerful and confident state took an economic nosedive. There were bread lines in New York's Times Square, and tents of the jobless huddled along Riverside Drive. In Washington, troops were fighting the bogus army that had invaded the capital. People were dying in demonstrations, strikes, and riots.

On October 7, 1931 BUSINESS WEEK magazine reported that Amtorg had received 100,000 requests from Americans who wanted to emigrate to work and live in the Soviet Union.

It is well known that in those years there were widespread expectations in left-wing circles that the severe crisis of the world capitalist system would finally bring about the world revolution. And long after that it was still believed that only the world war helped that system to stand up and survive.

On a theoretical level, critics of capitalism made two conclusions which left an imprint on subsequent relations between the two social systems.

Number one. In its development capitalism had reached the last stage, it was doomed and could prolong its existence only through militarization.

Number two. Recurring economic crises would inevitably push it toward aggression and wars, for it would have no other option.

Critics of communism took a similar view of the Soviet Union's development. They, too, made gloomy assumptions that communism could survive only through militarization and aggression.

The result was that both systems launched a massive effort to arm themselves.

By the way, much of what was then happening in politics was related to the theoretical prediction of the inevitable "historic clash" of the two systems. Preparations were being made for it both materially and ideologically, by waging a struggle on "the domestic front." In the Soviet Union the target was "cosmopolitism." In the United States McCarthyism reigned supreme.

Today we speak of U.S. achievements with respect. However, there was a time when such recognition was regarded in our country as subservience to the West. When I was young, perhaps the most popular slogan was that of catching up with America and surpassing it in per capita production. Militant ideology extended its grip even to dairy farms. In fact, there was no great distance between the tongue-in-cheek slogan "Watch out, Iowa cow" and the grim warning "We shall bury you."

An equally sinister and primitive perception of social phenomena prevailed in your country, too. Just for expressing sympathy with our country people were expelled from corporations, guilds, or universities. The "witch-hunt" swept this nation like an epidemic.

It took decades for more realistic assessments of both sides' intentions, capabilities, and possibilities to supplant those crude perceptions.

Nevertheless, each time either of the two systems ran into difficulties, there were recurrences of primitive ideologized thinking. There were predictions of the other side's imminent collapse, of its being consigned to the ash heap of history.

Alas, theoretical cannibalism was for too long present in the confrontation between the two systems. It does no credit to either of them, for it is contrary to the logic of mankind's development, to the historical dynamics of the emergence and existence of different social and political systems, and to man's eternal yearning to choose a proper system of social organization.

Without trying to convert anyone, let me tell you that the socialist idea emerged as a response to a profound need of society development—the need to achieve equality among people and social justice.

You may accept or reject socialism, but you have to admit that in many countries, including capitalist countries, current conditions of people's life and work, and a certain social and legal protection that they enjoy, bear a strong imprint of the socialist ideal, the socialist view of the world.

The influence of socialism was a factor, and not the least important one, that prompted the capitalist state to assume responsibility for the people's well-being and for some redistribution of benefits in the intersts of the poor and needy.

Socialism offered an alternative path of social development, a new interpretation of the problems of social justice, human rights, and many others.

You may point out that this is exactly what we now have in short supply. If that is so, if we failed to achieve something, let us pause to think why it happened.

We have become more open and candid than anyone else in denouncing our own mistakes, errors, and distortions. We are doing it because we need it. We need it to begin a new life for ourselves.

The accumulation of enormous power in the hands of the so-called supreme leaders brought misfortunes to many people. Centralism at the level of personality gave rise to the leaders' uncontrolled subjectivism. Today we denounce that rigid centralization and are dismantling the hyper-inflated administrative command system. The times have changed, and the future of our country and people can no longer be entrusted to such a system. But let's face it—there was a time when centralism was necessary for objective reasons.

Remember the intervention and the blockade imposed on my country. Remember World War II, when in just a few months we moved our industries across the Urals, and in a few years rebuilt the country from ruins. Without that centralized will, the country would have been run over by the Nazi war machine and would not have been able to save world civilization in that battle.

Without that will, our country would perhaps not have survived after the war in the face of atomic blackmail and later the nuclear threat.

There is no denying the fact of the Munich collusion and of plans to topple the Soviet Government. In this country few people expected the Soviets to survive for long. Could this be the reason why it took America 15 years to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union?

Action from outside generates counteraction from the inside. There were many such actions.

On a subjective level centralized will oppressed the individual but objectively it was brought into being largely by the force of external factors.

Here we come to the problem of our common responsibility. We have denounced our predecessors' errors publicly. We are filling the blank spots in our history with truth. But there are still blank spots in our common history. There is one dark spot, left by the first explosion of the A-bomb. I think that historians, political scientists and researchers have not yet said their final work on it.

Self-criticism is not humiliating to any nation. This standard is universal, and it does not apply to us only.

I am proud of my country's contribution to mankind's progress.

I am proud that my country put an end to the nuclear monopoly and is now laying the groundwork for a nuclear-free world.

I am proud that through perestroyka and new thinking it is opening up new vistas for itself and for the world.

One sometimes hears people say that our new thinking is a fantasy, that no such thing is possible. New thinking, it is said, calls for new brains which we do not have, since the architects of perestroyka were born by the old system and their primary concern is how to save it.

Well, it is true that our new thinking originated within the old system. But it emerged as a protest against its ugly deformities, as an effort to rid the country and the people of those deformities and to give the people a prospect of decent life in their own country and in the world community. Long before April 1985, when Mikhail Gorbachev articulated the credo of perestroyka, he and many people who shared his views had been nurturing the idea. Now that it has been translated into policy and has set the country in motion and changed so many things in the country and in the world, saving the system is not what matters most.

Indeed, much of our country's past is painful to recall. But rather than disavowing it, we believe we are duty bound, as our nation's sons, to rebuild our a society according to the original socialist concept.

We are changing what was built in contravention to the socialist ideals and human laws according to the whims of time-serving architects.

Any analogies and comparisons have limited value. But I would still say that to a certain extent our economic problems today are similar to the problems the United States faced in the early 1930s. Then, uncontrolled rugged individualism upset the balance in your economy, whose major components were quite sound and efficient. As one of your countrymen said, there was too much focus on production and too little on distribution and consumption.

In our country rigid regimentation at a certain stage stifled our economy, which, similarly, suffered from an overemphasis on production for the sake of production.

Today we are being criticized for introducing capitalist market elements, allegedly undermining our state-owned enterprises and thus, socialism.

But actually our economic system is undergoing an adjustment, a change in its trajectory. Something similar happened in the United States 60 years ago. But even then it took years and two New Deal programs to stabilize the economy.

And, ironically, President Roosevelt was then accused of "sovietizing" America and of ruining free enterprise.

It's appropriate to recall some views that were debated in American society in those years. According to the noted economic historian George Soule, during the early years of the great depression there was a lot of talk about the likelihood of revolution in America and the desirability of some form of communism in the country. One can read about all that in the August 1932 issue of HARPER'S magazine.

I would suggest that you read the press of those years. Then, perhaps, you might consider some articles in our magazines from a different perspective.

And, of course, powerful forces sought to slow down Roosevelt's reforms. Just remember how often the Supreme Court ruled that his regulatory economic measures were unconstitutional. The business community openly sabotaged them.

And I will just mention the radical opposition and populists as exemplified by Huey Long, who fought privileges and proposed dividing all the wealth equally among everybody.

Our perestroyka, the course of economic reforms, various forecasts and alternative positions must be examined in comparative context. Changes on the scale of a country like ours always give rise to debate, struggle, and predictions of imminent failure or even disaster.

I am convinced that one can only argue about how fast the Soviet economy can switch over to a new mode of operation rather than about its ability to readjust.

I am sure that the turning point will be marked by the Second Congress of People's Deputies and the fall session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which has begun to draft new legislation designed to put our economy on a new track.

At the same time, the reform of our political system will be completed. Elections of people's deputies to local soviets will be held in our republics, territories, regions, cities and districts. The elections will be absolutely free and democratic. As a result we expect the local soviets to become effective bodies of people's power.

We see, recognize, and say that the party—which was itself the initiator and organizer of perestroyka, renewal, and democratization—is today noticeably lagging behind the pace of perestroyka, democratization and renewal in our society. That too, should not be overdramatized for we should bear in mind that the party continues to operate mostly within its old pre-perestroyka structures. We need a new party constitution. It will be adopted at the 28th party congress. At the next stage a new party programme will be worked out.

Discussions in party organizations demonstrate that the party is aware of its tasks and of the imperatives of our time, and that it is willing to undergo a radical and comprehensive renewal.

The problem of inter-ethnic relations has become of extremely grave concern to us. In fairness, one has to say that it aways had some sharp edges, were sometimes blunted by propaganda or forcibly suppressed. Now that propaganda no longer lies and force is not a factor, hurt national feelings have come to the surface. But the paradox is that the national energy that has been given free rein by perestroyka is harmful to perestroyka when it assumes radical exaggerated forms.

Nevertheless, both the center and the national entitites share a common desire to affirm full-fledged sovereignty and autonomy for every nation within the framework of the Soviet federation. The center fully encourages the self-expression of nations, the development of national institutions and cultures, and greater economic independence of national entities.

Both at the national and local levels one common main challenge must be addressed, that of harmonizing the interests and rights of various groups. A solution to the nationalities problem must be found at the level of federation, but it also must be addressed in each territorial entity, seeking agreement among all nationalities living, for example, in an individual republic, as well as agreement with neighboring republics.

We make no secret of the problems existing in relations among the republics, autonomous regions and the center. However, they are political problems and, in principle, they can be resolved with the help of the center.

The problems of ethnic relations that engender separatism are much harder to solve.

It should be obvious that separatist trends are dangerous precisely because they can lead to the breakup and disintegration of national entities themselves, cause a sharp deterioration in relations between nationalities and pose a threat to the autonomy, independence and sovereignty of the republics.

I believe that through dialogue which must be calm, respectful and constructive and rule out any use of force, we can resolve many inter-ethnic problems, including the most acute ones. We do resolve them on the basis of the nationalities policy and our party's new nationalities platform.

As conceived, perestroyka must result in uniting our nations on a fundamentally new basis.

I am convinced that many tensions will be removed or at least eased by an expanding economy, stronger economic independence of the republics, better legislation, and a genuine rule of law.

Paradoxical at it may seem, in our over-regulated society the regulating mechanism has turned out to be weak. I am, of course, referring to legal regulation.

The political reform, for the first time in the history of our state, enables us to draft and adopt laws reflecting the will and interests of the people and relying on our society's political and national consensus.

We expect that perestroyka will receive a powerful impetus from the work of the Second Congress of People's Deputies and the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and other truly new bodies of local self-government,

I am speaking about our domestic problems in such great detail because today forecasting the future of perestroyka is the necessary context for considering the prospects of international development, including the future of Soviet-U.S. relations.

In the United States today much thought is being given to the factors that determine the dynamics of international developments. What are the opportunities that must be exploited and the risks to be neutralized, in other words, what will the world of the third millennium look like? We, too, are thinking about that. It would seem that for all the differences in our view of today's world, we share the recognition that it is at a crucial juncture. Politically the world has entered a new phase—it is moving out of the cold war into a period of peace.

And here we have to note that the world of politics is lagging far and dangerously behind the real world. The material unity of the world and its interdependence prompt the need for a common and coherent policy.

Models of society somehow resemble different models of computers. They may differ in speed, memory or appearance, but they use essentially the same components and compatible languages and programs. Compatibility of technological systems is a requirement of the economy, compatibility of policies is the most important condition for the survival of mankind.

Today it is faced with dozens of global challenges, each potentially deadly. We can meet those challenges only if we work together.

We no longer live in the time when some states or even an important group of states could decide everything in the world. Today we need a consensus, an international approach to global problems—not because it is a moral imperative, but for objective reasons, because the world is a single and interdependent whole, in which the so-called Third World is already playing and will continue to play an increasingly greater role.

Let me again draw an analogy with America's past. Are we not acting like those politicians who did not see great danger in the 1929 crisis and hoped that it would pass by itself? Right before our eyes the world is sliding into a deep economic depression. The debt of the third world countries, the interest they have to pay and the pace of their economic development—are these not the signs of an impending catastrophe? The response, however, has been most inadequate. The measures taken thus far can only temporarily mitigate or slow down some trends. They do not offer a way out or a solution. Radical bold steps are needed, a kind of new deal, a transition to a policy that would draw the developing countries into the scientific, technological and information revolution. It will be necessary to overcome a certain psychological barrier, to go beyond national concerns and to start thinking in global terms.

In any case, politics must urgently address ways of saving the world from an economic catastrophe.

One can well imagine a situation where a government would attack a conventional electric power station in a neighbouring country to prevent the poisoning of its people with sulphurous emissions.

If we do not come to grips with environmental problems, this scenario may prove realistic.

We could one day begin competing not for political supremacy or spheres of influence but for access to water, fresh air and even a green lawn.

Such conflicts could be caused by demographic problems, hunger and poverty among part of world's population, or by epidemics of infectious disease.

Take the problems we discussed at the Wyoming meeting. Among other so-called minor issues we agreed to cooperate in human genetic mapping and in studying pollution from area sources. We discussed transnational problems with President Bush. Those talks were serious and constructive.

Given all this, can there be any doubt that we need new thinking? An average diplomat today has to know as much as a Ph.D. knew one or two generations ago.

We were, indeed, late in adopting new thinking. Enormous efforts will be needed to make up for the lost time. And this is no easy thing to do.

Decades, of the cold war, unfortunately, did not pass without a trace. We are still confronted with the grave heritage of the receding era. The incredible burden of amassed weapons weighs heavily upon our shoulders. We have yet to rid ourselves from intolerance toward the views of others, from mutual mistrust and from attempts to continue the dangerous game of one-upmanship.

We have yet to free ourselves from that burden and at the same time to build a modern structure and a new machinery for managing relations among nations.

New political thinking is an attempt to understand the realities, to be bold enough to abandon approaches that have become a brake on society's development.

We in the Soviet Union are trying to work on the basis of that understanding. We do not impose our convictions on anyone. We just invite others to think together, to undertake a sober and objective analysis of the processes now underway in the world.

They are bound to affect relations between any states, above all such as the Soviet Union and the United States. Today they have to be different from what they were yesterday. They should be brought back to a normal state, one that corresponds to universal human standards and interests.

To accomplish that, we think it is necessary first of all to identify what is slowing down the development of our relations.

It is my conviction that the first thing we should reject and abandon is the total and pervasive ideological grip on our relations.

We shall remain different, each with our own interests and our own realities. At first glance, our sets of concepts are incompatible. However, if some of their upper layers are removed, it may well turn out that we are talking about the same things—freedom, equality, and justice. This makes it possible to formulate a broad international consensus based on the notions of universal human solidarity, the rights and freedoms of the individual, and a concern for peace and for man's natural and spiritual environment.

Mutual "nuclear deterrence" is another source of tensions.

Let us not oversimplify our attitude towards it, although, I must admit, we ourselves are aften guilty of such oversimplification

We give due credit to that doctrine, recognizing that for a fairly long period of time it was of some use in maintaining peace. The point is, however, that the new times call for a new policy, because "nuclear deterrence" inevitably perpetuates the totality of confrontational relations among states.

We are convinced that nuclear weapons must be abolished. Indeed, we need to do some thinking about where we are going and what the realistic ideal of our coexistence should be. We know well the code of confrontation and the limits of escalation, but we have little knowledge of the rules of joint action and cooperation. Is this not the time to begin to fill in that gap? For, if we have a future, it can only be based on a positive option in developing our relations.

The Soviet Union is now adopting a defensive doctrine. We are convinced that it opens up real prospects for radically reducing the level of military confrontation—both through unilateral cuts and through the conclusion of agreements.

The Soviet concept of moving toward a future without weapons of mass destruction was set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement of January 15, 1986. The ascent toward this model of security will obviously be a long step-by-step process. All its twists and turns are hard to foresee, but it has already started.

The Soviet Union and the United States have concluded the INF Treaty and are now successfully implementing it. A 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms is to be the next step. We spoke about this both with the

President and secretary of state. The agreed basic parameters of the post-reduction structure of strategic offensive forces may not be fully consistent with ideal notions of strategic stability. But I see in that another argument for further stabilizing reductions. Such reductions will, of course, require finding some sort of a common denominator in both sides' views of strategic stability.

It is no exaggeration to say that mankind's struggle for survival has a second front now, namely, preserving the environment. Without releasing substantial funds and resources through reductions in the military effort, no solution can be found to the environment problem.

Environmental protection is part of the new "basket" of transnational problems in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, alongside efforts to combat international terrorism and narcobusiness. The weight of that "basket" grows from one meeting to another.

The third set of issues requiring our attention is Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the economic field. We favour major efforts to develop such cooperation as part of the process of integrating the Soviet Union into the international economic system.

To those who continue to ponder the problem of whether or not to help perestroyka I would like to say that if they think in terms of charity, they are mistaken. We are not asking for that. Cooperation between us has to be mutually beneficial, meeting the interests of both sides.

We are now taking strong measures, including legislative action, to make our business activity compatible with yours. It is not smooth sailing. Problems are likely to arise, in particular because of the non-convertibility of the ruble and other things.

Our economic links could be of key importance in rebuilding today's fragile world order along democratic lines. Otherwise we will not avoid new contradictions emerging in the form of customs barriers or conflicting policies regarding oil or technology transfers.

Quite a few economic projects are now under discussion but they are very slow in getting off the ground. There is a need for unorthodox forms of cooperation, which would make it possible to establish wide-ranging and efficient links between the Soviet and U.S. economies on a long-term and reliable basis.

We welcome the Bush administration's declared willingness to make regional politics free of elements of rivalry between the USSR and the United States, between the East and the West. Such "disengagement" has already started, producing practical results in a number of regions. Propaganda contests are gradually giving way to painstaking negotiations, persistent mediation, and greater restraint and responsibility in practical policies.

I would be less than sincere if I said that the results thus far are fully satisfactory. They are not. Conflicts continue, and our efforts are not always consistent and sometimes fail to produce desired results. Serious contradictions also remain.

But a start has been made, and we should build upon the balance of interests created through the efforts of both sides.

There is yet another important point here. In pursuing non- confrontational policies in various regions, we are providing strong incentives for third countries to behave in a responsible manner. Let them rely upon our diplomatic advice and support rather than on Soviet or American weapons.

Human rights is the area where great and, for many people, surprising progress has been achieved. Here we have made a quantum leap to a new level of understanding and tolerance.

Yet, we cannot afford to be complacent. Indeed, we have to be always aware that we are late, that we are behind. For, while the talks are in progress, while we are seeking solutions and compromises, life does not stand still. There is a continued arms race and a growing danger of further proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and of missile technology. Nuclear testing and the production of weapon-grade fissionable materials also continue.

Conventional armed forces continue to be maintained at high numerical levels, while naval forces are not even discussed.

During our talks in Washington and in Wyoming we are able to move ahead substantially in a number of important areas. But the problems themselves remain, still awaiting solution. We must not miss the opportunities available to us now.

The next Soviet-U.S. summit should be productive. It should bring real progress in curbing the arms race. Let us not forget that other countries are watching the Soviet Union and the United States. And the other great powers. If we set a good example by showing our sincerity in disarmament and in cooperating for peace, third countries will follow suit. That would strengthen the global trend toward lessening tensions and assuring international security through political means.

This would be in the interest of all, certainly in the interest of our nations, the USSR and the United States.

Of course, this short review of the long road covered over the past years in Soviet-U.S. relations may make it seem easy. Believe me, it was not easy at all. Each step was difficult, and it took an arduous effort to bring together often conflicting interests. It took perseverance and courage on the part of the leaders of the USSR and the United States. Without their version of "new horizons" it would not have been possible to move aside the mountain of man-made prejudice and overcome the real inherent contradictions.

Yesterday I had a very interesting meeting with former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. We recalled our work together. There Were moments which I would describe as dramatic, there were considerable complexities and considerable difficulties, but there was also the will to find solutions, achieve new landmarks, impart a new quality to Soviet-American relations. To a certain degree, our understanding and personal contacts helped achieve this goal. I am greatly pleased that very businesslike, serious and constructive relations are being established with the current Secretary of State James Baker. I hope that these relations will help us overcome the objective difficulties our countries encounter.

The fact that it was so difficult to lay the ground work for our cooperation gives good reason to hope that the foundation is solid. For any great structure can be really solid if it is anchored in national or simply human interests. If those interests are supported by genuine feeling and thought. If they are backed up by the will to protect the results of the work done.

The new developments in the world should be viewed, not as part of the struggle for survival between capitalism and socialism, but in terms of real problems. The confrontation is between common sense and extremism, between political dialogue and military pressures, between democracy and totalitarism.

This view of the situation in the world underlies our thinking as we propose to the international community a comprehensive program of global cooperation encompassing the totality of issues on its agenda. A detailed blueprint for such cooperation was set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's address to the United Nations General Assembly last December.

As for the question of which of the two existing social systems will, in the process of such global interaction, prove to be the best in giving people greater freedom and well-being, let us leave it for future generations to decide. Most probably the exemplary social structure of the third millennium will synthesize all positive experience accumulated by mankind.

To conclude, let me emphasize my conviction that courage is the most important thing in today's politics. Today, it is not enough to be a realist who perceives life as it is. In addition, what is needed is vision and even idealism and a keen sense of novelty. Let us look ahead to the future rather than keep turning back to the past.

Then Shevardnadze answered questions.

TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 3 Oct

Bhutto's Remarks on Afghanistan

LD0310143189 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—Positive changes have emerged in the Pakistani Government's attitude towards an Afghan settlement, attesting to a more realistic assessment of the situation in that country, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's interview with the BBC yesterday, in which she called on the Afghan armed opposition to begin talks with the Kabul government.

The Soviet side has repeatedly emphasised that the earliest cessation of bloodshed and the start of dialogue between all warring groups and factions is the only sensible way to settle the Afghan situation, Perfilyev said.

The USSR backs the plan for a political settlement advanced by President Najibullah at the 9th non-aligned summit in Belgrade.

"The degree of the warring Afghan factions' participation in the future state structure should be discussed by the Afghans themselves," Perfilyev said.

No side should be ignored, he stressed. "And certainly not the central government in Kabul which is the country's leading political force."

Vietnamese Withdrawal

LD0410004289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (TASS)—The Soviet Union has no doubts about the fact that the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, the completion of which was announced 26 September, is final and complete. Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Directorate, stated this at a briefing here today.

He recalled that the withdrawal of troops was carried out according to a previously announced timetable and routes. One hundred-six observers from 20 countries and six international organizations, and 422 foreign journalists were present at the measures connected with the withdrawal.

Currently the second item on the agenda is the key issue: Putting an end to foreign military aid to all the Cambodian sides and averting a civil war, said the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman. He stressed that the "doubts" in the genuine nature of the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia being spread by some circles are providing Pol Pot's followers with the opportunity to step up military actions against their own people to seize power and to restore the genocidal regime. If any of the sides has doubts on this count, then these should serve as a subject of effective verification and not as an impediment to the settlement of the long drawn out conflict, noted Vadim Perfilyev.

Summary of Briefing

LD0310204189 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—Positive changes have emerged in the Pakistani Government's attitude toward an Afghan settlement, attesting to a more realistic assessment of the situation in that country, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's interview with the BBC on Monday, in whch she called on the Afghan armed opposition to begin talks with the Kabul government.

The Soviet side has repeatedly emphasised that the earliest cessation of bloodshed and the start of dialogue between all warring groups and factions is the only sensible way to settle the Afghan situation, Perfilyev said.

Commenting on the situation in Cambodia, he said the Soviet Union has no doubts that the Vietnamese troop withdrawal from that country, the conclusion of which was announced on September 26, is final and complete.

The key issue that remains on the agenda is the cessation of foreign military assistance to all Cambodian sides and the prevention of a civil war, the spokesman added.

He stressed that "doubts" circulated by some circles about the veracity fo the complete troop withdrawal from Cambodia enable Pol Pot's men to escalate hostilities against their own people in order to seize power and restore the genocidal regime.

The spokesman reported that Soviet envoy to Switzerland Zoya Novozhilova on September 29 deposited the instrument of ratification by the Soviet Union of additional protocols to the 1949 Geneva conventions on the protection of war victims with the Federal Council (government) of the Swiss Confederation.

He said the Soviet Union hopes that the ratification of the additional protocols is given its due by all those holding dear the noble cause of promoting humanity and delivering mankind from the scourge of war.

Perfilyev also told reporters that Giorgio Giacomelli, commissioner-general of the U.N relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) visited Moscow from September 30 to October 2 at the invitation of the Foreign Ministry.

During his talks here mutual satisfaction was expressed with the recent considerable expansion of cooperation between the USSR, including both official agencies and mass organisations, and the UNRWA. The hosts pointed out the importance of the UNRWA's activities to the provision of material and humanitarian assistance to Palestinians.

NATO 'Obstructing' Indian Ocean Conference

18070362 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 First Edition p 4

[Article by V. Kozin: "To Untie the Knot"]

[Text]**The current practice of a constructive approach to conducting international affairs is presenting a propitious chance to look at the knot of many global and regional problems in a new way; untying them has obviously been dragged out. Among the strongest of them, in the literal sense of a "sailor's knot," has been the problem of providing security in the region of the Indian Ocean, the creation there of a zone of peace and businesslike, mutually advantageous cooperation. World society has been involved in the consideration of this problem within the framework of the UN for 18 years now.**

The foundation for this prolonged process was laid at the 26th Session of the UN General Assembly, when, on 16 December 1971, by majority vote, it adopted resolution 2832, which proclaimed the Indian Ocean a zone of peace "for all times," and appealed to the great powers, littoral and continental states and other countries to begin consulting with one another for the purposes of implementing these goals. Since that time, about 20 other resolutions on the matter of the zone of peace have been adopted at sessions of the General Assembly, not to mention numerous similar documents approved by other international forums.

The UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean [SCIO] has been in operation for 16 years; it comprises representatives of 49 states. Its goal is the preparation of an international conference. On seven occasions, the UN has set periods to conduct this conference; six of these were thwarted by those who do not wish to see the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, based upon their own mercenary, narrowly egotistical interests.

It seems that a long-awaited breakthrough came at the Special Committee session held in New York this summer. On behalf of the group of non-aligned states and committee members, Sri Lanka introduced a qualitatively new draft resolution on the zone of peace issue, which for the first time in the long years of debate contained an exact date for conducting in Colombo the first phase of a UN international conference on the Indian Ocean. It must be held 2-13 June 1990. For the first time, key conference agenda issues are reflected in the draft of such a resolution. The agenda includes an examination of the situation in the region of the Indian Ocean, and the adoption of a final document containing the principles, methods, mechanism, and program of actions to realize the aims of the zone of peace, and other matters.

True, the draft resolution did not receive full support among the leading NATO countries participating in the committee's work, where the rule of consensus applies (unanimous vote). It must now be directed to the consideration of the First Committee, and in the event of its approval, it will be put to a vote at the 44th regular UN General Assembly Session.

The optimal variant for the international conference on the Indian Ocean would be participation by all concerned states, including the leading NATO countries. However, the conference must gather in Colombo in July of next year even in the event of obstruction on their part. The thing is that a portion of the representatives of the Western countries, the United States, Great Britain, and France in particular are not only disinclined to participate in the conference, but are against it taking place at all. As on previous occasions, they are attempting to prevent the conference's convocation, although the methods of obstruction are now somewhat different. Earlier, they applied a tactic which someone accurately encircled with a "verbal snare ": We will participate in the conference only in the event that the military and political situation in the region is favorable, and as it is not favorable, we will not participate in the conference." New traps have now appeared, since the situation in the region of the Indian Ocean has changed for the better and it is inappropriate to cite "the situation." In particular, the thesis that conducting the conference would lead to additional expenditures could almost ruin the UN's efforts for conducting peace support operations in conflict areas all across the globe.

Another argument is that the lack of clarity with regard to the nature of the conference in Colombo, and the decisions which it must make "disturb" the Western countries. Such "dullness" seems extremely strange if we consider the circumstance that the leading NATO countries have been directly participating in the special committee's work since 1980, and this is the only topic of conversation there.

Their attitude toward certain formulations of the documents under discussion at the committee's session was also indicative. During a discussion of the working group chairman's draft speech, which examines matters of the essence and the principles of the future of the zone of peace, a number of Western representatives came out against including the position that the participating states would refrain from a policy of economic force directed against any state's political independence or territorial integrity. A phrase stating that ending a foreign military or naval presence and eliminating foreign military bases is one of the most important aspects of achieving the UN declaration on the zone of peace also caused a negative reaction.

In brief, the group of leading NATO member nations openly opposed those positions which either prohibit external interference in the littoral countries' internal affairs, including use of armed forces, or which stipulate the elimination of the material infrastructure and basis for such interference.

During the course of the discussion, the apprehension was expressed that the Indian Ocean could become a closed region to navigation. But the authors and supporters of the concept of creating a zone of peace are certain that the zone will respond to the interests of all states, and that it will not undermine the principle of freedom of the open sea. In opposing the constant military patrol of the waters of the Indian Ocean by the naval fleets of states not of the region, which is accomplished by the most modern means of aggressive armaments, the overwhelming majority of states also consider it completely lawful that all rights of transit be reserved to them for combat ships and submarines in the water area, all aerial devices over it, scientific research and experiment conducted. port and airport calls to the region's states at their invitation for the purpose of rendering extraordinary and humanitarian relief, or implementing emergency repairs in the event of an accident. The experience of the elimination of the consequences of the Iran-Iraq conflict showed the importance of operations to remove mines from certain sections of the ocean. The possibility of the creation of a united UN naval force to keep the peace cannot be excluded in the future. Obviously, this condition must be taken into consideration while determining the status of the zone of peace.

In the committee, the socialist and nonaligned countries took the line for dialogue and the development of the discussion's positive elements. Speaking in an open session, the Soviet representative particularly emphasized that the fundamental part of the work required for holding the UN international conference in Colombo had already been completed, and that the positive trends in the international and regional situation allow that it be convened at the proposed time.

The appearance of the working paper "Measures for Strengthening Trust in the Indian Ocean," which GDR representative V. Grundman [name as published] disseminated to the committee on behalf of the socialist countries was a notable event. By comparison to a similar document disseminated in 1987, its new variant intensified the nuclear aspects of the naval confidence measures, as well as envisaged the possibility for exchanging information and the great openness with regard to the major naval undertakings and naval armaments in the region. In particular, positions on advanced warning by states with nuclear weapons as to their presence or absence on board their ships and submarines entering the Indian Ocean were included.

That which has already been achieved inspires the hope that the remaining discord regarding the political and international legal maintenance of the future zone can be eliminated on the basis of compromises and a balance of interests in the near future.

Aviation Conference Discusses Air Safety

PM0410132789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Shelkov report on interview in Montreal with M.A. Timofeyev, USSR deputy minister of Civil Aviation, under the "Our Interviews" rubric: "Making the Skies Safe"—date unspecified]

[Text] Montreal—The report on the French airliner crash in Africa arrived at the height of the sittings held the other day in Montreal at the 27th session of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Its participants observed a minute's silence in memory of the crash victims. By a sad coincidence the acuteness of the problems under discussion in Montreal—ensuring flight safety, stepping up the struggle against airborne terrorism, and putting a stop to air shipments of drugs—was emphasized by the recent air crashes.

Civil aviation is at a complex stage in its development, M.A. Timofeyev, USSR deputy minister of Civil Aviation and leader of the Soviet delegation, said in conversation with your PRAVDA correspondent. On the one hand, it has become an important element in the world infrastructure without which life in modern society would be inconceivable. Each year more than 1 billion people use air transport. On the other hand, the reliability of the air transport system gives cause for concern. Naturally, the question arises: Why, despite the huge material expenditure and the efforts of millions of specialists to create and operate comfortable airliners, do passengers still not feel completely safe yet?

One of the most major threats to civil aviation today is terrorism. Apart from the well known practice of hijacking aircraft, there have been more and more cases recently of terrorists resorting to blowing up airliners in flight. These crimes are particularly cruel and lead to a considerable increase in loss of life. One need only recall the bombing of the U.S. Boeing 747 over Scotland last December. There were 259 people on board. They were all killed. A very recent example is the UTA DC-10 crash in Africa.

This and similar cases show that the ICAO and its members have not yet been able to erect a reliable barrier to criminal actions. Terrorists continue to attack civil aircraft and, as we can see, some of their actions result in tragedy. But this does not mean that the ICAO is not taking any action in this sphere or is being passive. On the contrary, relying on the three international conventions on combating terrorism—the Tokyo, The Hague, and Montreal conventions—the organization has worked out international requirements for aircraft safety covering measures to prevent acts of illegal interference.

It seems that it is now necessary to find a formula for correct mutual relations between state organs and the mass media in covering acts of illegal interference in civil aviation activities. After all, it was no accident that A. Koteyt [name as transliterated], president of the council, noted in his speech that "criminals are often attracted not so much by the actual scale of the act of terrorism as by the extensive publicity given to such acts by the mass media." Another, no less complex problem relating to civil aviation security concerns the quite high level of accidents, the head of the Soviet delegation noted. World practice in operating civil aircraft currently shows that air crashes are mainly caused by pilot or air-traffic control errors, or by the destruction of airliner components. At the previous session of the ICAO assembly, the Soviet delegation proposed research into the impact of the human factor. At the USSR's initiative a world seminar on flight safety and the human factor will be held in Leningrad next year.

For the first time the current session included as an independent item on the agenda the question of the ICAO's role in combating illegal air shipments of drugs. Although in recent years the ICAO has actively tackled this issue, the scale of the problem is quite eloquently demonstrated by the fact that around 80 percent of the cocaine discovered in the United States has been delivered by air.

Shevardnadze's UN Speech Published in Pamphlet

LD0410105289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1626 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 October, (TASS)—"Destiny of the World Is Inseparable From the Destiny of Our Perestroyka" is the title of a pamphlet containing the speech by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign affairs minister at the 44th UN General Assembly Session on 26 September 1989. It has been published by the Pliticheskaya Literatura publishers.

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Yazov's Visit to U.S.

Meets Powell; Tours Pentagon, City

LD0310204889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As already reported, the official visit to the United States by Army General Yazov, USSR minister of defense, started 2 October. Our correspondent B. Kalyagin reports from Washington [video shows the Pentagon, cuts to Yazov and Powell chatting]:

In the Pentagon buildings, as they usually call the U.S. Ministry of Defense, Army General Yazov met General Colin Powell, the new chairman of the Committee of Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces. The sides gave a high appraisal to the contacts between the representatives of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the United States, which have already taken place, and discussed the possibilities of further development of military contacts between the two countries. [video shows Yazov and Powell shaking hands]

After the discussion Colin Powell acquainted Army General Yazov with the Pentagon building. [video shows Yazov and Powell, accompanied by a large, mostly uniformed entourage walking along a corridor]

Gen Powell is the first representative of the black population of the United States to hold the highest military post of the United States. He officially took up this post only 2 days ago. [video shows Yazov chatting outdoors to a uniformed man, with Powell standing next to Yazov, both accompanied by large entourage; cuts to Kalyagin standing outside the Pentagon]

The Soviet minister is the first foreign visitor the U.S. military chief has met as a leader of the Committee of Chiefs of Staff. This is, of course, a coincidence, but one can see certain symbolism in it, too. After all, holding a meeting like this would have been unthinkable quite recently.

After the talks in the Pentagon the USSR defense minister visited Arlington National Cemetery on Washington's outskirts. [video shows Yazov descending stairs, Soviet flag carried by honorary guard; cuts to show a group of onlookers] One of the places here held in highest esteem is the grave of the unknown soldier. Army General Yazov paid tribute to the U.S. soldiers fallen in the Second World War. A festive ceremony was held here in honor of this event. A guard of honor was formed from the representatives of five arms of the service: Airmen, seamen, infantrymen, marines, coast guard. [camera pans the guard of honor] The state anthems of the Soviet Union and the United States were played. [video focuses on military band playing Soviet anthem]

The USSR minister of defense laid a wreath at the grave of the unknown soldier. [video shows Yazov laying wreath]

Comrade Yazov then went sightseeing in Washington. He visited the memorial of one of the founders of the American state, Thomas Jefferson. [video shows Yazov sightseeing; visiting the Jefferson memorial, accompanied by entourage] The high Soviet guest also visited the Gettysburg Memorial National Military Park. [video shows Yazov and uniformed entourage comprising mostly Soviet Army officials walking through a park]

The USSR minister of defense is now being received in the White House by George Bush, the President of the United States.

Meets Bush, Leaves for New York

LD0410102189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2015 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Washington, 3 Oct (TASS) - TASS correspondents Vladimir Matyash and Andrey Fedyashin report:

U.S. President G. Bush on Tuesday received in the White House Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, who is here on an official visit. During the conversation matters of mutual interest were touched upon.

Present at the conversation were U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, Defense Secretary R. Cheney; B. Scowcroft, the President's national security adviser; and Yu. V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador in the United States.

The official White House report says that President Bush, welcoming the USSR minister of defense, noted that his recent conversations in Washington with E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, had been "very fruitful". The head of the U.S. Administration asked for these words to be conveyed to M.S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader. The President said that he intends to continue the talks between the United States and USSR. Answering questions from journalists, D.T. Yazov expressed the hope that there would be progress in the Soviet-U.S. talks on arms control. In response to a request to say if new contacts were being planned between the USSR and the United States in the military sphere, the Soviet minister said: We had a meeting with Defense Secretary Cheney on Monday which lasted all day. We outlined many positions on which we could implement contacts, and we intend to draw up a special contacts plan for 1990. It is planned to elaborate a whole program which will facilitate improving mutual understanding between the two countries.

D.T. Yazov wished the American people well-being and prosperity.

On 3 October, D.T. Yazov visited the National Military Park in the town of Gettysburg in Pennslyvania state. Members of the Soviet military delegation viewed the historical ensemble on the site of the Gettysburg battle 3 July 1863, when the Federal Army won a major victory during the Civil War between north and south. D.T. Yazov was accompanied by R. Cheney.

That same day the USSR minister of defense addressed teaching staff and students at the U.S. National Defense University and met L. Aspin, chairman of the Armed Forces Committee of the Congressional House of Representatives.

During the conversation, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, the favorable influence of restructuring in Soviet society toward improving the political climate in Europe and worldwide was stressed. It was noted that the first visit in history by a USSR defense minister to the United States serves as a positive factor in contemporary international relations.

On Tuesday afternoon Army General D.T. Yazov arrived in New York, where he made a speech to the International Relations Council.

Further on Moscow Send-off for Yazov

PM0310132589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit to United States"]

[Text] On 1 October Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, left Moscow for an official visit to the United States at the invitation of U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney.

He was seen off at the airport by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General P.G. Lushev and Army General K.A. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense ministers; Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and other officials.

The sendoff party included J. Joyce, U.S. charge d'affaires in the USSR, and Captain P. Huchthausen, naval attache at the U.S. embassy in the USSR.

Shevardnadze Departs U.S. for Nicaragua, Cuba

LD0310153689 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 3 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze departed from New York today. He headed the Soviet delegation at the 44th U.N. General Assembly. The Soviet foreign minister will visit Nicaragua and Cuba.

Washington Scene Viewed as Congress Resumes

PM0310143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 89 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Fall in the Capitol. New U.S. Congress Session"]

[Text] Washington—Those "hazy, crazy, lazy days of summer" celebrated in the old American song are behind us. Officials have returned from their traditional vacations to steamy, heat-faded Washington.

The deserted offices have returned to life, streams of automobiles fill the capital's streets at rush hours, and newspapers literally "swell" in front of your eyes, although there is not so much information about any events but more opinions, assessments, and forecasts, as is the custom at the beginning of the new political season. In short, a scene that is repeated year in, year out.

Although, however, this year's scene has a character all its own.

Before setting off for their homes in the first half of August some legislators openly admitted that they had done little to deserve their vacation. In its 7 months of work the 101st Congress has been thin on results. Interparty squabbles raged and scandals resounded in the main on Capitol Hill, while the business on the agenda either progressed with difficulty or was put off until the fall. As a result a host of these questions has piled up, and the Senate and the House of Representatives will have to do a good bit of work in the coming months.

It is reckoned that a newly convened Congress always takes quite a long time to get down to work. This is all the more true of the current Congress because there has been a change of guard in the White House. Since the U.S. supreme legislative body is historically a "responsive" institution of power, this year it had to wait a particularly long time for the "presidential agenda." Unlike his predecessor R. Reagan, who arrived in Washington with a more or less concrete action program, President G. Bush was clearly in no hurry to put forward his own initiatives, confining himself on the whole to general, sometimes vague declarations. Things even reached the point where the administration began to be accused of being "paralyzed" and "drifting," and G. Bush had to justify himself in public on several occasions.

In principle, of course, the slowness of the president and his team could be attributed to the tremendous amount of work involved in the transitional period, the formation of a Cabinet, and the resolution of cadre questions. (Incidentally, according to Democratic Party investigation group data, as of 10 August 160 of the 394 leading posts in the administration requiring Senate ratification were still vacant). But such an explanation would only be partially correct. It was rather a question of cautiousness on the part of G. Bush, who was somewhat apprehensive in trying out his presidential garments. The dream of being president and a moral readiness to be president are one thing. Actually becoming president is quite another.

Hence the particular stress on cooperation with the Congress, which can be traced back to G. Bush's inaugural speech. The fact that this is no coincidence is illustrated by the following figures—in last year's November elections the Democrats increased their majority in both houses (55 as opposed to 45 in the Senate and 260 as opposed to 175 in the House of Representatives). This means that the current alignment of forces in the Capitol requires the administration, at least at first, to go to the Congress, as they say here, "cap in hand." In this respect R. Reagan had an easier time since, in the initial stages of his presidency, his party had control of the Senate and the White House could rely on a "working majority" of Republicans and conservative Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Nothing perhaps at first demonstrated the change of political climate in which the new administration will have to operate so clearly as the Senate's refusal to approve J. Tower's candidacy for the post of U.S. defense secretary. G. Bush was the first president in 30 years to have his choice rejected by the legislators, who unequivocally indicated, figuratively speaking, the direction in which power flows down Washington's Pennsylvania Avenue—from the White House to the Congress or vice versa.

Despite the exchanges of pleasantries and the assurances of devotion to "bipartisan cooperation," the object lesson proved painful, and G. Bush must be given credit for having learned it. There have subsequently been many other emotional clashes but nothing humiliating has occurred, at any rate there have been no ideological battles like those waged by R. Reagan. Certainly to this day relations between the White House and the Congress can be described as by and large cordial, even if they are disrupted by outbreaks of localized conflict of limited significance. I believe that should be considered a quite normal phenomenon, given the well-organized and effective system of mutual dependence and mutual limitation between all three (legislative, executive, and judicial) branches of power enshrined in the U.S. Constitution.

Whether it is a good thing to have what people in America call a "coalition government" where the White House is held by one party and the other—although formally in opposition—has control of the Congress is another matter. This is open to debate, and political specialists here engage in that. At the recent American Political Science Association's annual congress in Atlanta, in particular, the participants were split into at least two camps. Whereas the first claimed that this situation undermines the leading functions of state institutions and the government's ability to implement domestic and foreign policy, the second tried to show that there are no grounds for concern—something which can be illustrated, in addition, by such important agreements as the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty and the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, which were ratified by the Congress in conditions of a "coalition government."

However, all this is theory. In practice for 24 of the last 40 years and 18 of the last 22 years the country has been led by such "coalition governments," with a Republican president and a Democratic Congress. Voters who favor this situation clearly see nothing terrible in it.

Today people here are drawing attention to the fact that the president has emerged as a more complex figure than was previously thought. He has a quite different style from R. Reagan, and G. Bush demonstrates a greater readiness for reasonable compromises and a greater flexibility than his predecessor.

The president's firm opinion that politics are a personal matter requiring persuasion and negotiations is demonstrated fully in his relations with the legislators. People poke fun at the fact that G. Bush tries to shake hands with everyone and look them in the eye. America's "First Family," with their pious belief in the value of personal contacts, scrupulously watches to see that no legislator is left unattended. Virtually all the senators and a good proportion of the representatives have attended various White House "social engagements" in the last few months. None of them has been heard to complain that G. Bush used the invitation to exert any pressure on them.

It may seem paradoxical, but the president's attempts to "tame" the Democrats are incurring the fire of criticism from his own Republicans, especially those on the right wing of the party. Bush's conciliatory tone, in their opinion, dangerously smooths over rather than emphasizes the contradictions between the two parties and therefore could result in the Republicans' simply remaining in the minority. They warn that G. Bush's compromises do not give the voters grounds for switching to the "Republican train," yet the midterm elections are to take place within a year.

It is worth remembering something else today. After the enforced retirement of J. Wright, speaker of the House of the Representatives, and T. Coelho, deputy leader of the Democratic Majority, the Democrats had to effectively reorganize their leadership this spring, while at the same time putting down the Republicans' attempts to gain political capital from the sensational scandal. If we do not count T. Foley, who transferred from the post of majority leader to that of speaker, it was men of a new generation—R. Gephardt, who became leader of the Democrats, and W. Gray, elected his deputy—who found themselves in the "number one positions."

The problems of the regrouping in the House of Representatives were also compounded by the fact that, since becoming leader of the Democrats in the Senate, G. Mitchell has hitherto failed to show his strong points. Since he was not the only contender for this post, following his victory Mitchell mainly set about broadening his base among the Democratic senators. Under these unfavorable circumstances, naturally the party's activeness suffered.

In other words, the Democrats are now tasked with surmounting their own differences and, when they have rallied their forces, with elaborating an original, creative, and attractive program: "The Democrats have a choice: They can move to the attack now or they can sit on the fence hoping for an economic recession," journalist M. Kinsley rightly pointed out.

According to tradition, the Congress' resumption of work after the vacation means that fall has arrived in Washington. Having heard enough thanks, recriminations, wishes, and instructions, legislators have assembled in the capital from various areas. G. Mitchell, leader of the Democratic Majority in the Senate, and Speaker T. Foley have promised that the Congress will be more energetic. President G. Bush in turn opened the season with an address to the country in which he put forward the administration's new program for stepping up the war against drug racketeering. He immediately incurred the first official criticism this fall, which was for many people further proof of the Congress' increasing skepticism regarding the sincerity of the president's assurances of his readiness to cooperate. The president, Speaker T. Foley said, is putting forward a popular program but is not proposing any options for financing it.

Incidentally, people here believe that budgetary and financial questions in general will be the main focus of parliamentary battles.

Democrats on Capitol Hill are in a gloomy mood since they see no means as yet of overcoming their intraparty disagreements. Nor is there any great merrymaking in the White House. Everyone is predicting increased tension for the president in relations with the Congress.

Although, of course, predictions by no means always come true in politics.

China

PRC Leaders Send Anniversary Message to USSR

PM0310102789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[PRC leaders' greetings message]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

To Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

On behalf of the Chinese Government and people, and on our own behalf we send the Soviet Government, the Soviet people, and you personally ardent congratulations in connection with the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the PRC and the USSR.

China and the Soviet Union are close neighbors united by common mountains and rivers, and between whose two peoples there is a traditional friendship. In the 40 years since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the PRC and the USSR Sino-Soviet relations have had their ups and downs. This May Chairman Gorbachev paid a visit of historic importance to our country and Sino-Soviet relations were normalized. We sincerely hope that Sino-Soviet relations will enjoy steady, stable, and healthy development based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence, and we wish the Soviet people more and more successes in socialist building.

Yang Shangkun, PRC president
Wan Li, chairman of the Chinese National People's Congress Standing Committee
Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council

Deng Xiaoping Assessment of Summer Riots Cited

PM0310134389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Deng Xiaoping Statement"]

[Text] Beijing, 2 Oct—The spread of bourgeois liberalization in the PRC has led to the CPC giving up certain ideological positions. It is now necessary at all costs to defend the "four cardinal principles"—to hew to the socialist path of development, to strengthen the Communist Party's leading role, to implement the democratic dictatorship of the people, and to follow the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong thought. This was stated by Deng Xiaoping, president of the PRC Central Military Council, at a meeting with Yi Chong-ok, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo and DPRK vice president, who is in Beijing to celebrate the PRC's 40th anniversary.

Touching on the riots in Beijing this spring and summer, XINHUA reports, the Chinese leader noted that ultimately what happened has "been of use to us, since we have become more sober-minded as a result." China's friends need not worry—public order has long since been restored in the country, Deng Xiaoping stressed.

GDR-Bound PRC Delegation Stops Over in Moscow

PM0310142789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Moscow Stopover"]

[Text] The Chinese party and government delegation headed by Yao Yilin, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and vice premier of the PRC State Council, stopped over in Moscow 2 October en route to Berlin to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the GDR.

The delegation was met and seen off at the airport by V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, other officials, and Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

Talks were held on topical problems of national economic development in the two countries and on certain questions of Soviet-Chinese relations. The talks were held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Gorkiy Automobile Plant Marketing PRC Goods

PM0310102389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Correspondent A. Yershov report: "Gorkiy Automobile Plant's Chinese Contracts"]

[Text] Gorkiy—The working people of Gorkiy Automobile Plant have recently been buying goods from the PRC in their own stores.

There are clothes, footwear, complex domestic equipment, canned meat products, tea, and much else. Where have these scarce products appeared from?

"Our enterprise supplies China with Volga passenger cars and spare parts," S. Zimin, chief of a department of the Gorkiy Autombile Plant's foreign trade firm, said. "A certain amount of currency had built up recently, which we decided to spend on acquiring imported consumer goods. We concluded contracts to the tune of R20 million. Since the range has recently expanded considerably, we recently leased a former branch of the automobile plant's department store, where some of the goods from China are sold by invitation. Construction of a new trade center is now being completed at the plant, which will permit a considerable improvement in services for the plant workers."

Northeast Asia

Razumovskiy Receives Chingel, Mongolian Delegation

PM0310140189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties, a delegation headed by G. Chingel, member of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee and chief of the MPRP Central Committee party building department, was in the Soviet Union 25 through 30 September.

The Mongolian comrades were acquainted with the experience of the CPSU's work on the democratization of party life and the improvement of collaboration with state and public organizations under the conditions of perestroyka. There were talks at the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, People's Control Committee, All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee, the Lyubertsy City CPSU Committee, and labor collectives of the Moscow region.

The delegation was received by G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Commentary Views Thatcher's Visit to Japan

OW0310140889 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 Sep 89

[By station commentator Dmitriyev]

[Text] The following are the comments by Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev on British Prime Minister Thatcher's visit to Japan:

According to the REUTERS, during her talks with Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu, Prime Minister Thatcher forced Japan to make a choice between two options: whether to lift import controls or to keep those controls and suffer the indignation of the world. Of course, as Prime Minister Thatcher herself knows very well, many of such import controls are rooted in Japanese political and cultural tradition. A recent report by the U.S. Congress also noted this point. Under such circumstances, the lifting of the various import controls would mean the reexamination of the Japanese social tradition which gave rise to such controls. It would also mean a thorough change of the Japanese society into a Western society and the complete incorporation of Japan into the Western camp.

However, the reason for Prime Minister Thatcher's unfailing determination is that the problem is too overwhelming. She told the Japanese businessmen: For whatever reasons—cultural reasons and other traditional reasons—many obstacles will remain unchanged. To the other countries, Japan is taking advantage of the priveleges of the free trade system one-sidedly. Prime Minister Thatcher criticized Japan saying that, to make an analogy with riders in a vehicle, Japan is like a free rider.

Prime Minister Thatcher's remarks clearly indicate the prospects of trade frictions not only between Japan and the United States, but also between Japan and the European countries. In the worst case, this may develop into a trade war.

The Paris Summit was held last July. An article carried in the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK on the eve of the summit cited many cases on the brink of a crisis of trade war. The article's author pointed out that one reason for the aggravating trade friction at present is the relaxation of international tension. According to the article, as the image of the USSR as an enemy fades away, the issue of trade friction has come to the forefront. We do not argue with the validity of the statement. However, a more important point is that the problem lies in the free trade system itself. First and foremost, a contradiction exists between the interests of international capital and the national interests of the capitalist countries. Prime Minister Thatcher, in an attempt to harmonize such interests, said that the elimination of trade barriers would benefit the Japanese consumers. However, this was not a desirable thing for the Japanese farmers. Although the farmers' interest is concerned with the question of liberalization of imports alone, considering the great number of problems in world trade, the free trade system will undoubtedly be put to test again and again in the future.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Quayle's Visit Seen as U.S. Pressure on Bases

HK3009054989 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] A meeting with Philippine President Corazon Aquino and the delivery of a personal message from U.S. President George Bush was one of the primary reasons for the visit to the Philippines of U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle. In his letter, the U.S. president requested the opening of talks with the Philippines on the future of U.S. military bases in that country.

According to the present agreement, the lease on the military bases is to expire in 1991. It is for this reason that the Washington government is pressuring the Manila government to extend the lease for another 5 years.

Naturally, the U.S. military bases issue became the focus of Quayle's visit to Manila and figured prominently in his talks with top political leaders, legislators and influential businessmen in the Philippines. The theme of his speeches centered on the call for retention of the military bases even as opposition to the bases by anti-war movements is growing rapidly in the Philippines.

Peace can be achieved through strength and can be guaranteed by the military bases. This was the gist of Quayle's speeches and statements in his meetings in the Philippines.

However, his is simply one argument. Many political observers in the Philippines also note the statement by the USSR Ambassador to the Philippines Oleg Sokolov who asserted that regional peace can only be attained through disarmament. The Soviet position is entirely understandable as it conforms with the aspiration of the people of the region. Such aspiration was reflected in several incidents which took place during Quayle's visit in the Philippines.

The visit was a stormy one. Several senators opposed to the maintenance of U.S. military bases in their country boycotted a diplomatic reception held in Quayle's honor. Protest marches were also launched by students. Police were sent in to deal with the protesters, many of whom were arrested for their action. The intensity of the opposition to U.S. military bases may be gleaned from the slogans such as "Down with U.S. military bases" which followed Quayle wherever he went, especially when he visited Clark Air Base in Angeles and Subic Naval Base in Olongapo.

Quayle's visit shows that the United States has no plan to pull out its military bases in the Philippines. Instead, the visit merely highlights Washington's true intention of extending the agreement on the military bases.

Meanwhile, reports said that the Philippine Government has set up a commission to study alternative uses of the military facilities in the event that the U.S. military bases are pulled out of the country. President Aquino also announced that the country is prepared for the eventual withdrawal of these bases and that these facilities will be used for other purposes within a year. So far, findings have shown that Clark Air Base can be converted into an international airport, while Subic Naval Base may be transformed into a port. The question, though, is this: When will these plans be implemented?

The Manila government will definitely face strong pressures once talks on the military bases begin. There is no doubt that promises of financial assistance and national security will figure in the talks. This will be followed pressure from the private sector and, finally, the most potent pressure from Washington as demonstrated by the visit to Manila by the U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle.

Valentinov Analyzes Thai Stance on Cambodia

BK0410034689 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Station observer Viktor Valentinov's commentary: "The Cambodian Conflict and Thailand's Stance"]

[Text] In the past 20 years, with conflict dragging on in Cambodia, Thailand has on many occasions changed its attitude regarding the events in this neighboring country.

At one point in the past, the militarist regime in Bangkok did not hesitate to support the toppling of Samdech Sihanouk who was then head of the neutral government. Later on, it sided with the Lon Nol regime, the pro-American regime in Cambodia.

For 3 and ½ years while Cambodia was under the rule of the Pol Pot clique, Thailand had been compelled to defend itself from attacks and incursions by the Khmer Rouge. On several occasions, the Thai authorities often raised the problems related to the aggressive acts by Pol Pot's Cambodia for consideration by the United Nations.

In 1979 Thailand suddenly changed its attitude. The reason for this change is still unclear to all. The Bangkok government widely opened its border to Khmer Rouge elements fleeing from Cambodia and allowed them to take refuge and set up camps and military bases in Thai territory.

Moreover, with the permission of Thai authorities on-the-spot, Thailand has become an area from where military aid is transported to the Pol Pot clique, and a springboard for the clique to launch aggressive acts against Cambodia, a country in which the people's state power has taken root.

World opinion says that without this Thai assistance, the Cambodian opposition groups would certainly be unable to survive even for a month. This opinion seems to hurt the Bangkok leaders. This is why they have begun to adjust their attitude toward Cambodia according to the requirements of the current situation.

Circles in Asia have reacted positively to Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan's initiative proposing that talks on the settlement of the Cambodian problem be resumed, primarily regarding the signing of a cease-fire agreement among the warring Cambodian groups.

Because the Pol Pot clique turned a deaf ear to the Thai Government's initiative, it seems that Bangkok is preparing more resolute measures for ensuring tranquillity along the Thai-Cambodian border. Proof of this is the recent press conference held in the Thai capital by Lieutenent General Narudon Detpradiyut, representative of the Thai Armed Forces Supreme Command. If what he proposed is ever implemented, it would certainly create favorable conditions for ending the bloodshed in Cambodia. According to the general's statement, the Thai Armed Forces Supreme Command estimated that a civil war would only bring misery to Cambodia. The only discreet way to reach a solution to the Cambodian conflict is political concession. This is why the Thai military authorities have reviewed their attitude toward the Khmer Rouge, whose camps and bases are in Thai territory.

Lt Gen Narudon Detpradiyut said that Thailand would no longer allow the Khmer Rouge to use Thai territory for launching a civil war in Cambodia. The leaders of the Pol Pot camps will be allowed to cross the border only when they are unarmed. Thai military authorities will ensure that this policy is carried out. There is also another important prospect. According to the general, Thailand will no longer allow anyone to use its territory for transporting arms to the three Cambodian opposition groups.

Our observer Viktor Valentinov further comments: Frankly speaking, this is the first time that I have heard about such an attitude from Thailand. What I was hearing about almost everyday was the continued transportation of foreign aid to the warring Cambodian groups, particularly the Khmer Rouge. It should be noted that Western observers stressed that the passage of these weapons cut right across Thai territory. However, this Thai announcement is welcomed if its goal is really to stop the flow of weapons and not to conceal the true events. Particularly, this intention coincides with the consensus among the ASEAN countries that lethal aid to all warring Cambodian forces should be ceased simultaneously.

If such an agreement is honored, it will be a good contribution to peace in Cambodia and Southeast Asia as a whole.

Commentator on Likelihood of Cambodian Civil War

BK0410091289 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Station commentator (Oleg Shchebrov) commentary]

[Text] Distressing reports have been received from Cambodia. After the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from that country, the forces of the opposition parties based in Thai territory have actively stepped up their military operations. It has been learned, however, that fighting took place along the border only.

Our commentator, Comrade (Oleg Shchebrov), was of the opinion that such a development was predictable, for no political solution to the conflict had been found when the Vietnamese troops started withdrawing from the country. The efforts of Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, who has been trying to persuade the warring factions of the need for a cease-fire, were in vain despite the fact that Phnom Penh was prepared to take that step. How would the situation in Cambodia be like in the future? Would those who claimed that after the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops a furious civil war would break out be proved totally correct in their belief? If so, the civil war would surely bring nothing but more sufferings to the Cambodian people.

Such a development would worsen the political atmosphere in the region. However, I personally think that the flames of the civil war would not engulf the whole of Cambodia. Why? First of all, this is because the opposition parties would compromise and scale down their activities. Sihanouk and Son Sann just could not continue to pretend forever that they were not deeply disturbed by their current allies, the Polpotists. In the years of their rule over Cambodia, the latter slaughtered quite a few of Sihanouk's children. The only thing that has brought the opposition groups together so far is the slogan about their struggle against the so-called foreign occupation. Now the Vietnamese troops have returned home. At the same time, in my opinion, Phnom Penh has become militarily strong and its prestige has grown. This has allowed Phnom Penh to wield control of the situation in the country. All of this has made me think that sooner or later the Cambodian parties would make concessions to each other. For the time being, it is difficult to foresee a clear image of these concessions. However, the opposition parties of Sihanouk and Son Sann do not have other means to stay out of the framework of the national process.

It is entirely a different story to say that the attitude toward concessions may be fraught with further complications because of the activities conducted by external forces. Indeed, the United States has planned to increase military aid to the so-called noncommunist groups in the rank of the Cambodian opposition, and Beijing has also stated its readiness to continue providing arms for the Pol Pot clique. Fresh arms supplied to the warring factions certainly constitute a distinct danger hampering the efforts to normalize the situation in Cambodia.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Response to Mideast Peace Moves Urged

LD0310220689 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov:

News agencies report that the PLO Executive Committee received a message from Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, containing a proposal to hold a direct dialogue between the PLO and Israel in Moscow.

The Soviet minister announced in New York late in September after a meeting with Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens that the USSR is ready to mediate the organisation of a Palestinian-Israeli meeting. Although Tel Aviv has not responded officially to this initiative, the PLO has taken a constructive stand, showing serious yet flexible political course aimed at settling the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In Tunisia PLO Executive Committee member Muhammad Abbas said that the PLO regards the soviet proposal "as an important step in the peace process" and called on the Israeli Government "to give a positive reply without any preliminary conditions".

I'd like to point out that Shevardandze made this proposal for the first time during his stay in Cairo last February (regrettably, neither the West nor Israel attached any importance to it at that time).

The Soviet proposal reflected our country's consistent desire to use all opportunities to establish a lasting and just peace in the region and to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Palestinian problem, including an international Mideast conference under the U.N. aegis.

When taking this initiative, the Soviet leadership proceeded from the fact that important moves made by the PLO—the recognition of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 on the Middle East—are the basis for a direct dialogue between the Palestinian and the Israeli leadership.

These moves have created a new situation in the region, to which the Israeli leaders should respond in a new way. However, Prime Minster Yitshak Shamir makes negative pronouncements all the time, saying that he would never negotiate with the PLO.

But it is self-evident that there will be no settlement in the region if Israel continues ignoring the PLO. This organisation is a real force which cannot be ignored, as it is impossible any more to maintain an explosive status quo in the region.

There is nothing new in Shamir's stand. True, the prime minister does not reflect the opinion of the entire Israeli people. It is not by chance that a serious political crisis developed in Israel's ruling coalition, caused by Shamir's negative attitude to the PLO.

The Israel Labour Party, another partner in the coalition, advocates a direct dialogue with the PLO. A public opinion poll, conducted by an independent organization called DAHAF, showed that the overwhelming majority of Israeli citizens backed direct Israeli-Palestinian talks.

Arab Challenge Causes More Mideast 'Polarization'

PM0210152389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent D. Velikiy dispatch: "Steps in Opposite Directions"]

[Text] Cairo—A top-level meeting of representatives of the member countries of the Arab Cooperation Council [ACC]—the Yemen Arab Republic, the Arab Republic of Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan—has ended in the North Yemeni capital. This was the third meeting of heads of state.

The high frequency of top-level meetings undoubtedly reflects the increased attention which the ACC countries are devoting to imparting a concrete and finished appearance to their newborn organization. And further steps were taken in this direction at the meeting in Sanaa. Namely, 16 documents governing ACC activities were signed.

Political questions were discussed particularly widely at the meeting. The Palestinian problem, Iran-Iraq relations, and the Lebanese crisis figured among them. As expected, the area most commented on in the press was the Palestinian question. Of course, it is no coincidence that it is the focus of attention right now, since the tension in the confrontation between the forces which advocate its speediest and just solution and those slowing it down and trying to torpedo it, is beginning to reach critical proportions.

This is expressed, above all, in the political crisis in the Israeli cabinet, which has been exacerbated appreciably as a result of disagreements among its members over the Palestinian question. It seems to have been detonated at the present stage by the 10-point working plan for a settlement proposed by Egypt, which has been greeted with attention in many Arab countries. Although the plan obviously does not aspire to the role of the definitive version for resolving the Palestinian problem, nevertheless it demanded a response from the Israeli side.

At first, this demand was such that many people began talking of the collapse of the Israeli Government coalition. But now, as Prime Minister Y. Shamir has declared, it has been possible to shape in the cabinet a "united" attitude—a negative attitude to the Egyptian plan.

In light of this development of events the position expounded by the ACC heads of state at the meeting in Sanaa appears very interesting. And it must be said that incomparably more unity and good will was heard in their opinions than in the views of the Israeli cabinet members. The resolution adopted in Sanaa emphasizes, in particular, that precisely the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; accordingly, inter alia, it must be represented in elections. An appeal was also made to hold an international conference at which the painful question could be resolved fairly.

It is also very significant that the participants in the Sanaa meeting made a determined appeal to the United States to elaborate at last a more clear-cut and realistic stand with regard to the Palestinians' rights to self-determination and also with regard to the idea of holding the aforementioned conference.

So it can be stated that, after some vacillation, the Israeli cabinet, which is torn by contradictory opinions, has taken a step backward in its reading and assessment of the realities of the Near East situation. At the same time four Arab states, which are undoubtedly supported by many countries in the region, have unhesitatingly taken a step forward. The result is a still greater polarization of positions.

Gorbachev Adviser Zagladin on Peace Process

TA0310112589 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 3 Oct 89 pp 1, 2

["Exclusive" interview with Vadim Zagladin, President Gorbachev's political adviser, by 'Aqiva Eldar in the Moscow offices of the NOVOYE VREMYA newspaper; date not given]

[Text] [Eldar] Could you point at ways, alternatives to an international conference, through which the USSR could propose to promote the peace process in the Middle East?

[Zagladin] We are not dealing with the Middle East issue on our own. Members of the UN Security Council and other countries are operating with us. Nonetheless, the ways to reach a peace agreement—which is essential for the Middle East—must be determined by the parties directly involved in the dispute. We, together with France, have proposed to summon an international conference. This idea won the support of many countries. Meetings and discussions of all kinds could be held at such a conference. In my opinion, this is the most realistic way to solve the problem. I want to be optimistic; unfortunately, I realize that the situation in the area is very difficult.

[Eldar] What is your stand concerning the 10-point plan?

[Zagladin] The plan is not addressed to us. It is directed to the parties to the dispute. We will react when the stands are clear.

[Eldar] How do you explain the contradiction between your support of Iran and through it, in practice, of Hizballah and your declarations condemning terror?

[Zagladin] Every country is entitled to its own policy. I can tell you that we in the Soviet Union are opposed to terror and identify with countries that oppose terror.

[Eldar] What could the USSR contribute to calm the Israeli fear of a dialogue with the PLO, which they consider a terrorist organization?

[Zagladin] I do not believe that the USSR should convince the Israelis that the PLO no longer believes in terror, because the PLO itself can do so. We have held many meetings with the PLO leaders, and they know our position well. We believe that the PLO position has changed drastically in the past year. You must realize, however, that the organization's position would change favorably in parallel with a positive change in Israel's position.

[Eldar] Are you satisfied with the role Syria is playing in the area?

[Zagladin] Syria is a party to the conflict, and it should be party to the efforts to solve it. Furthermore, Syria, like other countries in the region, should increase its involvement in the search for a solution.

[Eldar] Hungary recently decided to reestablish diplomatic relations with Israel. What must happen for the USSR to take such a step?

[Zagladin] The end of the conflict in the Middle East would be the best reason to renew ties with Israel. The opening of the international conference would be a cornerstone for that. Incidentally, in past years there has been closer contact between our countries and an ongoing dialogue is being held. Your very visit here is proof of that. I believe this is the road that will lead us to mutual understanding and normalization of relations; however, the act of reestablishing political ties, which is a moment of symbolic value, is dependent on a settlement of the dispute.

As for Hungary, it is an independent country, and it can, of course, do whatever it pleases. It should be noticed, however, that the announcement of the reestablishment of ties was not accompanied by a change in the Hungarian attitude toward a solution in the Middle East.

[Eldar] What is your feeling toward Poland, your neighbor, which is a member of the Warsaw Pact and is run by a noncommunist government?

[Zagladin] Poland is an independent state which is entitled to decide on the type of government it wants alone. I wish to state that Poland will remain very active in the Warsaw Pact and in economic relations in it. Relations might even become closer. We have common interests on key issues concerning peace and foreign relations.

[Eldar] Is a noncommunist government possible here as well?

[Zagladin] I do not believe that our people would vote for a noncommunist government, though already today we have government members who are not party members, and there could be more. The major element of our new policy is to incorporate representatives of the people in the Congress and the Supreme Soviet and take part in making important decisions on foreign and domestic issues.

[Eldar] You maintain that your difficult economic and ethnic problems can only be dealt with through the people's involvement. When,in your opinion, will the masses join the effort?

[Zagladin] Your question is not phrased correctly. Not only do the Soviet people support perestroyka, but they also wish to hasten the process. We are discussing ways to implement perestroyka and hasten its pace. The solution of one problem creates others. This is normal. Discussing the issues at hand is essential for finding the true solution.

Official Says Afghan War 'Blunder,' 'Not Wise'

LD0310161189 Tehran IRNA in English 1600 GMT 3 Oct 89

["Moscow Blundered in Invading Afghanistan, Admits Soviet Official"—IRNA headline]

[Text] Peshawar, Oct. 3, IRNA—A Soviet official here has admitted to his country's blunder in invading Afghanistan.

'It is not wise to consider a war good when it has no objective,' said Ivona Andotov, who led a delegation to Peshawar early this week for talks with Afghan mujahideen regarding Soviet prisoners.

He reiterated that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was not something wise.

On the objective of his visit to Pakistan, he said he was here for talks with Afghan muhajideen for the release of the Russian soldiers.

According to the Soviet list 123 soldiers are said to be missing in action. 'We don't know how many of them are still alive, said Andotov,' and hoped the mujahideen would release their Russian captives as a humanitarian gesture.

He said the Soviet people were not pleased with the war in Afghanistan, and felt happy when Soviet forces pulled out from that country.

In the current circumstances no one except those who are affected by the war think about it since the war is no longer a problem for them, he concluded.

Committee Continues Work To Release POW's

LD0310214489 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Islamabad October 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Semenenko:

A declaration of the People's Committee for saving Soviet soldiers imprisoned by Afghan rebels "Nadezhda" (hope) has been working in Pakistan for the fourth week to speed up the release of Soviet prisoners of war.

Over the past ten days the delegation has held three rounds of talks with representatives of the Peshawar leaders of the Afghan opposition in the town of Peshawar near the Pakistani-Afghan border. They discussed practical conditions for release of the first group of Soviet POWs.

This is the second attempt by Nadezhda committee to agree with the opposition leaders on the release of Soviet soldiers, the committee's head Iona Andronov told TASS.

Although the committee's first attempt last summer did not produce any real results, it exposed the insurgents' intentions in regard to Soviet prisoners and helped to begin the second round of talks.

At present, in a major shift of position, Afghan opposition leaders have agreed to release the first group of Soviet soldiers. They have conditioned this action on a number of reciprocal demands.

"We tried to meet all the previous demands, but they turned out not to be enough. Therefore, we continue to search for a solution to this issue that is acceptable to both sides. I assure the families of imprisoned Soviet soldiers that we are exerting great effort and are supported by Soviet diplomats in Pakistan. Pakistani Foreign Ministry is also helping. I would also like to thank the Soviet Peace Fund which provided for our work in Pakistan," Andronov said.

The Nadezhda delegation continues talks with the insurgents to ensure the earliest return of Soviet soldiers.

Tehran Seminar on Afghanistan Viewed

TA0310173589 Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1500 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Igor Sheftunov commentary within "The World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: The second international seminar on Afghanistan is currently being held in Tehran. In addition to the leaders of the eight Afghan opposition groups based in Iran, leaders of some Afghan opposition groups comprising the seven-party alliance, as well, have arrived in Tehran from Pakistan to take part in this seminar. Our correspondent Igor Sheftunov has written the following:

During his recent news conference, Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati told correspondents that the leaders of all seven Afghan opposition groups based in Pakistan had been invited to participate in this seminar. The most radical leaders, though, including heads of the seven-party alliance in Peshawar, such as Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, Khalis, and [name indistinct], chose not to come to Tehran. I believe they realized the contradiction with others' statements that would have occurred had their calls to continue the war in Afghanistan been reiterated in this seminar.

It has become obvious, now more than ever, that the military option for resolving the Afghan problem has no future at all. Last February, following the end of the withdrawal of Soviet military forces from Afghanistan, leaders of the seven-party alliance in Peshawar stated that they would occupy Kabul within 1 or 2 months. But now, most of these Afghan opposition leaders admit that it is necessary to seek, somehow, a political means of resolving the Afghan problem. Moreover, the extremists are trying to occupy the towns of Jalalabad, Khowst, and Qandahar, but their efforts have met with failure. This series of defeats has brought to their senses those Afghan opposition leaders who have the ability and readiness to assess the situation realistically.

Sebghatullah Mojadeddi, head of the so-called transitional government established by the seven-party alliance, said during his statement at the Tehran seminar that he welcomes proposals aimed at resolving the Afghan problem. I believe that one of these proposals, which is more sound than others, was presented from the respected rostrum of the recent conference of leaders of nonaligned states and countries in Belgrade. During his statement at this conference, Afghan President Najibullah proposed that broad-based talks be conducted between the government of the Republic of Afghanistan and all Afghan political forces, both inside and outside the country, that support an end to the war. Najibullah pointed out that the main purpose of such talks should be to prepare a nationwide conference that would include all interested forces. Furthermore, in the plan presented by Najibullah it is envisioned that a 6-month cease-fire be declared, general elections be held under UN supervision, and a new parliament and government be formed in the country.

These proposals by Najibullah have enjoyed broad support among nonaligned countries, including India and Yugoslavia. Currently these countries' representatives are participating in the present international seminar on Afghanistan held in Tehran. They are stressing, among other things, that it is important that Afghanistan's close neighbors be included in the process of a peaceful solution of the Afghan problem.

In this connection, the statement in the seminar by Tanvir Ahmad Khan, Pakistan's ambassador to Iran, has drawn the immense attention of political observers. During the seminar he read the message of Pakistani Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan, in which it is stated that the authorities in Tehran and Islamabad are to cooperate with the aim of resolving the Afghan problem through political means. The proceedings of the seminar in Tehran indicate that at present more suitable conditions are becoming available for such a solution to the problem.

Expectations for UN Iran-Iraq Peace Plan Viewed

NC0410102089 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Iran's Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati said in his speech to the UN General Assembly that the Islamic Republic of Iran is ready to exchange prisoners of war with Iraq on the basis of the UN secretary general's new program. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes:

As we know, more than a year has passed since the war on the Iran-Iraq fronts stopped. However, no serious progress has so far been made toward completely overcoming the war situation between Iran and Iraq.

Five rounds of talks between Iran and Iraq at foreign ministerial level have not yielded any results, and it even seems that the tension in Tehran-Baghdad relations has considerably intensified lately. During recent months, hostile remarks have been heard both in Iran and in Iraq; and this further exacerbates the situation.

Varying interpretations of UN Security Council Resolution 598 by Iran and Iraq constitute the major obstacle to the peace talks between the two countries. From a study of the issue of prisoners of war, the difference in the approaches of Iran and Iraq on this resolution becomes very clear.

It should be recalled that, on the basis of information in hand, Iran is holding about 70,000 Iraqi soldiers and Iraq 50,000 Iranian soldiers in captivity now. The Iraqi Government has so far claimed that the prisoner of war issue is a purely humanitarian one, proposing that all the prisoners be released irrespective of the course of the peace talks. On several occasions Baghdad has expressed its readiness to exchange all prisoners of war without any preconditions. But Tehran has decisively rejected this proposal. In Iran's view, on the basis of Resolution 598 the Armed Forces should be withdrawn to international borders first. Only when this has been done is Tehran prepared to start an exchange of prisoners of war.

Apparently the new plan by the UN secretary general proposes a logical way out of this problem. Not everyone knows yet what the details of this program are. But, as pointed out in UN circles, Perez de Cuellar's new proposals call for the exchange of prisoners of war between Iran and Iraq in tandem with the withdrawal of troops to the international borders.

Iran's agreement to this proposal means a specific change in its stance in the talks with Iraq. Apparently Tehran has decided to take a step toward compromise with Baghdad and is hopeful that the Iraqi Government will reciprocate.

It should be said that some of the positive results of the Iran-Iraq talks on the prisoner of war issue are surfacing now. For example, in the past 2 years Iran and Iraq have exchanged more than 1,000 sick and disabled prisoners of war under the supervision of the International Red Cross. Recently, in a goodwill gesture, Tehran released about 1,500 Iraqi soldiers.

Thus, as you can see, the two sides are finding more and more points in common on this issue, truly raising hopes that tens of thousands of prisoners of war will return to their homelands in the near future.

In his remarks to the UN General Assembly, the Iranian foreign minister said: We are prepared to continue the direct talks with Iraq under the aegis of the UN secretary general.

In conclusion, our commentator writes: The entire world is anticipating positive results from the Iran-Iraq talks this time.

Kuwait's Relations With Iran, Shiites Viewed

NC0110121089 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 30 Sep 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The Kuwaiti Government has dissolved the council of directors of the religious and cultural organization which was comprised of the Kuwaiti Shiite sect. The members of the dissolved council of directors were asked to submit all documents and funds given to their employees by the government. As KUNA reported, this decision was made because of general social interests, the interests of the council members themselves, and primarily, the interests of the country.

Official circles have not divulged the reasons for the dissolution of the council but diplomats in Kuwait link this incident with the execution of 16 Kuwaiti Shiites recently in Saudi Arabia who were accused of staging the explosions in Mecca during the Hajj rituals. Saudi television carried confessions of the accused, who confirmed that they had received incendiary material from Iranians and had congregated at the social-cultural center of the council located at the (haffali) square, to discuss details of the terrorism program. These confessions were videotaped and shown on Saudi television.

The Kuwaiti Shiite sect is traditionally under the influence of the Iranian Shiites. In the past 10 years, during which Kuwait supported Iraq in the Iran-Iraq war, the Iranian leaders tried to use the Kuwaiti Shiites as a lever to exert pressure on the Kuwaiti leadership. This led to direct (?exerting) of pressure. For example, in November 1983 Kuwaiti citizens who were members of the Al-Da'wa party, which closely cooperates with the Supreme Defense Council [as heard], caused some explosions in the country's capital.

Even today, the Islamic Jihad (?call) party exists and has a publication called the (RESALAT AL-KUWAIT) which is printed in Cyprus and criticizes the Kuwaiti Government's domestic and foreign policy. Traditionally, the Kuwaiti Government refrained from comment on the terrorist and subversive activities of the pro-Iranian Shiite group in the country and abroad because it wishes to maintain acceptable ties with the Iranian leaders. After the end of the Iran-Iraq conflict, Iranian-Kuwaiti relations improved considerably. However, anxiety persists and as the recent incidents proved, there are reasons for such anxiety.

Future relations between Iran and Kuwait depend primarily on the Iranians themselves. If the moderate and pragmatist faction gains the upper hand in Tehran we can logically expect a halt to the export of the Islamic revolution and a cessation of interference in the affairs of Arab countries. However, if the irreconciliable extremists are victorious, then certain serious and warning steps will be taken in Arab capitals which will not only be limited to measures such as the dissolution of the council of directors of Shiite organizations as in Kuwait.

Shevardnadze Meets Counterparts in New York

LD0310083189 Moscow TASS in English 0705 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 3 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on Monday had a detailed talk with P.V. Narasimha Rao; Indian minister of external affairs.

The ministers both lauded Soviet-Indian relations as exemplary for present-day inter-state contacts.

Shevardnadze and Narsimha Rao exchanged opinions on key issues of world politics. They considered the possibilities for an intensification of international political dialogue in the interests of reducing tension, achieving fresh progress in disarmament and resolving regional conflicts. The two countries' positions were similar in many respects.

Soviet-Indian cooperation issues were also considered by the two foreign ministers. They pointed to the rhythmical nature of the implementation of projects. The goal of increasing Soviet-Indian goods turnover by 150 percent in 1988-1992 is regarded by them as quite attainable.

Shevardnadze emphasised that much importance is being attached in the Soviet Union to the centenary of the birth of Jawaharlal Nehru. Activities on this occasion will take place in Moscow, in republics and cities of the country.

Narasimha Rao, having expressed gratitude for this, said that a high-level Indian delegation would attend a ceremony in Moscow on November 14 this year to unveil a monument to Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shevardnadze met Tariq Aziz, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The two ministers expressed satisfaction with the onward development of bilateral cooperation in various fields and reaffirmed mutual striving to further broaden them on a mutually beneficial basis.

The two sides focussed their attention on the task of consolidating and developing the negotiating process between Iran and Iraq and directing it towards practical accords with a view to implementing U.N. Security Council Resolution 598 in all its provisions.

The importance of using the entire array of diplomatic means and of support for the mediatory mission of the U.N. secretary-general and his special representative was emphasised.

The two sides called for more active efforts towards a settlement of the Middle East conflict and reaffirmed support for the Palestinian Liberation Organisation's constructive policy and emphasised the need for a political solution to the Lebanese crisis without delay.

Shevardnadze met Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' later the same day.

Matters aimed at further developing Soviet-Syrian relations, including deeper political interaction between the Soviet Union and Syria were discussed during the meeting.

When considering the situation in the region the two sides called for increasing efforts to promote an international Middle East peace conference and to move on to practical steps to prepare it. The importance of improving the inter-Arab climate, particularly normalising Syrian-Palestine relations, was emphasised in this context.

The participants in the meeting welcomed the resumption of the mission of the League of Arab States (LAS) Committee of Three on Lebanon and spoke out in support of the earliest political settlement of Lebanese problems.

Shevardnadze received Mr Reichman, a prominent North-American businessman. Some matters concerning the development of the Soviet Union's foreign economic relations were dealt with.

Pallayev Delegation Meets Moroccan Party Leader

PM0310142589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interesting Discussion"]

[Text] Rabat, 30 Sep—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is making an official visit here met Friday with Ali Yata, member of the Chamber of Representatives (parliament) and secretary general of the Party of Progress and Socialism. During a warm, friendly conversation, in which other members of the party leadership also took part, the sides briefed each other on the activity of the two states' supreme legislative organs. The Soviet delegation head described the progress made in carrying out political reform in the Soviet Union and the results of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which was a major event in the country's sociopolitical life. The present USSR Supreme Soviet session, he pointed out, has to adopt a number of important draft laws aimed at speeding up the process of revolutionary renewal of Soviet society.

Ali Yata, for his part, stressed that the Moroccan people are following the restructuring under way in the USSR with great understanding and attention.

An interesting discussion took place on the development of friendly Soviet-Moroccan relations. Noting that these relations have good prospects, the participants in the meeting confirmed their mutual desire to further strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation in all areas. The important role which the two countries' parliaments are called upon to play in this matter was stressed.

On the same day the Soviet parliamentarians visited a state phosphates administration and a thermal electric power station in the country's economic capital—Casablanca.

Received by Parliament Members

LD0410033289 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Rabat October 3 TASS—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, on an official visit to Morocco, on Monday met Ahmad Osman, president of the chamber of representatives, and parliament bureau members.

In a constructive and friendly conversation, the sides discussed bilateral relations and other issues of mutual interest and exchanged views on topical international problems.

Addressing the Soviet guests, Osman pointed to the importance of the changes in the Soviet Union and to the great interest shown by the Moroccan leadership and King Hassan II in the Soviet reforms.

He welcomed the Soviet efforts to strengthen international security and initiatives towards disarmament and the settlement of regional conflicts.

Osman said the positions of the two countries on many international issues are close or coincide and expressed confidence that this creates favourable possibilities for deepening bilateral ties in all areas.

The head of the Soviet delegation, Gaibnazar Pallayev, vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet and president of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, spoke about the current USSR Supreme Soviet session and preparations for elections to republican and local soviets (councils).

He spoke highly of Soviet-Moroccan relations and emphasised the Soviet Union's readiness to further develop them in various fields.

Both sides pointed to the need to strengthen inter-parliamentary relations between the two countries by establishing contacts between standing parliamentary committees and within the frameworks of international organisations, above all, the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

The president of the Moroccan Chamber of Representatives gave a luncheon for the Soviet deputies.

Demands of Sudan's 'Southern Fighters' Viewed

EA3010175989 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Vladimir Ivanov commentary from "World Events Today"]

[Text] Three months have elapsed since the Armed Forces took over the government again. It appears as if events in the history of Sudan move in a cycle: military coup, dictatorship, popular uprising against dictatorship, parliamentary rule followed by a military coup. The question is: Will Sudan now be able to break this cycle? It would be good if this were possible. But this depends, as history has taught us, on the maturity of all healthy organizations in the country and the creation of opportunities where every organization can take part in the affairs of the homeland.

To get things in the proper perspective, let us turn to the existing realities. A committee has been formed in the country charged with the responsibility of looking into ways of achieving a peaceful solution to the problems of the south. A general amnesty has been extended to all who fought against past regimes. However, at the same time, parliament—including the Council of State and Council of Ministers—was dissolved. All parties, trade unions, and social organizations were banned.

The imprisonment of politicians has been stepped up of late. The prisoners are from various parties and trade unions, but the majority are from the left—Communists. Once again party leaders Muhammad Ibrahim Nuqu, Al-Tijani Babakr, and other well-known leaders have been imprisoned. At the same time, the most prominent leaders of the corrupt regime of ex-Marshal Numayri, which was toppled by the popular uprising in April 1985, have been released. It is worth noting that the leaders of trade unions and democratic organizations who were in the frontline in ousting Numayri are now the victims of the present regime.

With the prevailing situation, it is very difficult to find ways to resolve the chronic problems facing Sudan including the problem of the south. The southern fighters are not participating in the efforts of the committee seeking to resolve the problem of the south, having declared that the prevailing situation was not conducive to talks. The conditions they demand of the regime are increasing, including the release of all political prisoners, and ending the ban on parties and trade unions.

There is no doubt that the stance adopted by the fighters in the south makes sense. Experience teaches us that the shortest road to national reconciliation is never that of imprisoning people and stifling their rights, but that of negotiations and the search for solutions acceptable to all concerned.

Indian Ambassador Received at Foreign Ministry

PM0210110189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Sep 89 Moscow Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Official Reports"]

[Excerpt] USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov received A.S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request 22 September. A number of questions of bilateral Soviet-Indian cooperation and also certain topical international problems were discussed in the talks. [passage omitted]

Sub-Saharan Africa

TASS Notes Cuban Withdrawal From Angola

LD0410035789 Moscow TASS in English 1957 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Luanda October 3 TASS—As 15 hundred Cuban servicemen left for home today, the Governments of Angola and Cuba completed the withdrawal of half the Cuban military contingent from Angola scheduled for the end of October 1989, General Pericles Fereira Gomes of Brazil, chief military observer of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM), told reporters here.

He said that work for the verification of the second, concluding stage of Cuban troops withdrawal from Angola will be started in the first week of November.

The Brazilian general expressed gratitude to Angola and Cuba for unswerving implementation of their obligations.

Angola Says Cuban Withdrawal May Be Suspended

LD0310160189 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 3 TASS—The Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola may be suspended if the United States continues to give aid to UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], Angolan Foreign Minister Pedro de Castro van Dunem said here on Monday [2 October].

The United States has repeatedly promised to normalise diplomatic relations with Angola and cease supporting UNITA provided the Angolan Government agrees to a withdrawal of the Cuban military contingent from the country, he said. In actual fact the U.S. is breaking this promise.

Despite the fact that the Cuban troops are being withdrawn strictly according to schedule, the U.S. continues to flagrantly interfere in Angola's internal affairs, the minister pointed out. At this point the weapons which UNITA has received from the United States and South Africa will enable it to carry on subversive actions in the republic's territory for another four or five years.

Van Dunem told journalists that he intended to present his government's position and discuss the U.S. approach to the Angolan settlement issue at a meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. He said he was waiting for a confirmation from Washington that such a meeting would be held. He warned that he might suggest a suspension of the Cuban withdrawal if the United States did not cease secret military aid to UNITA.

According to the press, a meeting between U.S. President George Bush and UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi has already been scheduled for Thursday.

Savimbi said he arrived in the United States to request a continuation of U.S. military aid. Recently the U.S. Administration is known to have decided to increase aid to UNITA from 15 million to 80 million dollars a year.

Angolan Peace Plans Like 'House of Cards'

MB0310110989 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 3 Oct

[Igor Petrovskiy commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The plans on a peaceful settlement in Angola, connected in this or that way by the name of Savimbi, remind one of a house of cards. The [word indistinct] in the house is the concept that UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] is an independent—at any rate no less than MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola]—national political force that quite justifiably claims its share of power. On that concept rests the second flaw—America's support for the fighters for justice [words indistinct] trampled on by the Angolan Government.

And a policy of the mediator in the contacts between UNITA and the government of the People's Republic of Angola, President Mobutu of Zaire, had quite recently been considered as a linking unit between the two. However, all this structure may be turned upside down [words indistinct] space will be the American interests in Angola, and the support for the so-called fighters for freedom that reflects those interests with exceptional accuracy [words indistinct] others' interests. But all that little changes the essence which [word indistinct] on the fact that the time of Savimbi's visit to Washington the house of cards began to tremble threateningly [words indistinct] the first to go to pieces was the linking unit.

Savimbi does not consider President Mobutu to be his ally anymore, and there is no hope that the former relations will be restored as Mobutu refused [word indistinct] Savimbi and the United States [words indistinct] just like anybody else has to take into account the general opinion in Africa which is definitely on the side of the Angolan Government, and the interests of the business and finance world in ending the war and [words indistinct] is also essential.

The [words indistinct] in the process of the peaceful settlement has been dragging out for too long, and every [word indistinct] day makes it more evident whose fault it is. As a result the question about the expediency of American (?aid) to Savimbi is getting [words indistinct] the position of the People's Republic of Angola not to yield to the pressure from outside is unchanging [words indistinct] you know the situation is becoming ever more clear and it is ever more complicated for UNITA [words indistinct] because of [word indistinct] that giving up criticism of Mobutu which might prove not quite safe in [word indistinct] situation.

In Washington Savimbi practically proposed to the United States to be a mediator in the process of the Angolan settlement [words indistinct] not to seek [word indistinct] as has become quite evident. But so far this does not give any answer to any of the significant questions. Even such a simplified structure doesn't make the house of cards of Savimbi's plans any more stable. The prospects of a peaceful settlement in Angola will acquire a realistic shape only in the case when the meeting Savimbi is going to have this week with the delegation of the Angolan Foreign Ministry will be convincing the new [word indistinct].

Kenyan Diplomat Holds Talks With Adamishin

EA3009070089 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Political discussions were held between Kenya and the Soviet Union in Moscow today. Anatoliy Adamishin, the Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Bethwel Kiplagat, the permanent secretary of Kenya's

Foreign Ministry, discussed African issues in general, and southern Africa, in particular. They also examined the root causes of the crisis in the Horn of Africa. They raised the question of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Kenya and agreed to strengthen such cooperation in future. They also agreed to continue the exchange of ideas in future.

East Europe

Migrants 'Dazzled' by West, Ignore GDR Successes

PM0310152989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview in Berlin with Hermann Kant, head of the GDR Writers Union, by correspondent V. Lapskiy: "To Set Minds in Motion"; date not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Lapskiy] The GDR has achieved a great deal in 40 years: It is now one of the world's top 10 most economically developed countries, it is possible to envy its social achievements, and its citizens do not fear for their future. Why, then, have so many citizens left the GDR in recent weeks and moved to West Germany? How can you, as a writer, account for this phenomenon?

[Kant] It is impossible to give an unequivocal answer to this question. The phenomenon in question is new only in terms of its scale, so to speak. People migrated before. But there is no denying that it has come as a shock to us all today. It seems to me that the most shocked are those who believed that everything was going swimmingly here. Alas, not everything.

If you talk about satisfying vital needs, life here is certainly not bad. Comparing our living standards with standards in the majority of other countries, above all socialist countries, you can see how high we have risen. But it is possible to take as the reference point, let us say, the standards that the Americans, West Germans, or Japanese have.

You must also take account of this specific factor: People are migrating from one German state to another German state. Everyone seeks to raise his own material living standard as high as possible, but our society's potential for this is sometimes limited. Those engaged in politics must take account of this natural human need. But the migrants include many who have been dazzled by the brightness of Western store windows, which is something that can dazzle. Unfortunately, we do not have that many achievements that dazzle or immediately strike you.

Let us take this example: Our women can walk along unlit streets at night with no fear for their safety—they are confident that nothing will happen to them. There is no denying that it is pleasant to live in a calm, safe atmosphere. But if you say this to someone, he will be amazed: So what? We might spend a whole day discussing a new model of a car but not more than a minute talking about guaranteed safety on the street or the absence of fear for our life and honor. We have tremendous achievements, but they do not always strike the imagination—rather, they are perceived as something natural. Should we constantly remind people of them? People simply will not stand for it and will demand to be left in peace.

Practically every family here has received an inexpensive separate apartment. This has become the norm. It would be another matter if people could be offered the choice of several apartments for different rents, as in the West, although prices there are sometimes simply murderous. Of course, the possibility of a choice is tempting. There is a mass of problems in questions of housing in the FRG, and there are tens of thousands of homeless people, but nonetheless I will not claim that we have left it behind in the matter of resolving housing questions. We are implementing an impressive housing program which enables people to breathe freely, but this certainly does not mean that we live under heavenly conditions. [passage omitted]

GDR's Neubauer Protests FRG 'Gross Violation'

LD0410025189 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Berlin October 3 TASS—The permanent representative of the GDR in West Germany, Horst Neubauer, speaking to Bonn Chancellery Minister Rudolf Seiters, protested against what he described as West Germany's violation of promises in regard to East German refugees seeking to leave for West Germany from the West German Embassies in Prague and Warsaw, an official report said here today.

Neubauer said that the GDR "expected the West German Government to take steps to ensure the normal activity of its diplomatic missions in Prague and Warsaw, meeting international practices."

He noted that there had been a relevant agreement on this score. "West Germany's failure to comply with it is regarded in the GDR as a gross violation."

He demanded that the new East German refugees, admitted into the West German Embassy in Prague, be returned home. Once there they could declare their intentions.

Neubauer said decisions will be taken on these declarations in accord with previously-made assurances.

ADN Commentary on Refugees, Life in the West

LD0410025689 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 3 Oct 89

["Freedom, FRG style: Right to Work not Envisaged—ADN-attributed headline]

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—On the night of September 30 former GDR citizens illegally staying at FRG Embassies in Prague and Warsaw were expelled to the FRG.

The GDR's humanitarian act ended untenable conditions in the overcrowded FRG legations which had not been through its fault: Hygienic conditions were disastrous, and the outbreak of epidemics possible.

FRG media are now trumpeting the expellees had that way bought a "ticket to Western freedom". Political observers here, however, wonder whether the great word "freedom" will live up to what it holds out once the floodlights of FRG television are trained off the scene, the alleged refugee drama no longer has marketing value and the people now posing as "martyrs" in front of cameras and microphones are released into FRG everyday life.

What everyday life there is about is evident from three reports carried by news agencies at the beginning of the week.

Not for the first time, indeed, representatives of trade unions and churches demanded in Bonn on Monday that the right to work be finally implemented in the FRG as a fundamental human right.

Getting to grips with over 3.5 million jobless was one of the most urgent tasks and duties of the FRG Government, it was said. Unemployment was described as a social evil, a serious threat to humanity. FRG authorities see things differently. The news item quoted the FRG Federal Labour Office and the country's employers' association as saying "a right to work is not compatible with the principles of FRG market economy."

The second news was that the president of the FRG's charity organization, Karl-Heinz Neukamm, in a newspaper interview predicted GDR people would make bitter experience. Unlike in the GDR, there was a shortage of jobs, affordable housing and kindergartens in the FRG, he said. Integration into society, he said, would be more than cumbersome because social tensions in the FRG were expected to worsen.

The third item was headlined "Hamburg Police Evicts Sinti and Roma". Some 250 Sinti and Roma people living in the FRG for decades had been camping on the premises of the former Nazi death camp of Neuengamme near Hamburg for several weeks. During Hitler Fascism in Germany (1939-45) many gypsies were murdered in that camp. Their action was meant as a protest against degrading treatment by the FRG authorities and against their imminent expulsion from the wealthiest country in Western Europe which has no room for Sinti and Roma.

Three reports from the FRG. Three reports which show what is left of "Western freedom" in everyday life.

Three items which do not fit into the picture of the "golden West" as drawn by the FRG media. But they fit all the more into the picture of that society.

Moscow Radio on GDR Refugees, Bonn's Role

LD0310193889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1544 GMT 3 Oct 89

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] In the past weeks the world press, radio and television have been reporting quite a lot about the growing stream of refugees from the GDR to the FRG. According to some data their number already exceeds 30,000—this is unofficial data. [video shows map of Europe with GDR and Polish borders lined with thick pencil]

This process is taking place via two routes.

First, as it were, runaway tourists [begaturisty] from the GDR departed after having come to Hungary specially for this purpose. This was objectively assisted by the circumstances that Hungary had recently opened its border with Austria, and via Austria the East German citizens cross into the FRG.

The second route is through FRG Embassies or consulates in a few capitals of socialist countries, where until recently, some 5,000 GDR citizens, who had, as it were, fallen victim to West German propaganda, and who had decided to request political asylum from the Bonn authorities, had already accumulated. [video shows 2 (?Czech) policemen talking to man near wall, other policemen near embassy wall, people climbing railings] Refugees from the GDR, urged on in the FRG, are regarded as citizens of one nation, of their own nation as it were, and receive West German passports automatically without any problem.

And so, seeking to display goodwill, the GDR Government permitted its citizens, who had ensconced themselves in West German mission, to set off to the FRG on special trains. In doing so an accord was reached with the West German side to the effect that after the departure of those who were requesting asylum it would close its embassies to new attempts of this kind. Alas, it looks as if Bonn is not in a hurry to fulfil its half of the compromise. A telegram from Prague reached us today. It reports a new accumulation of GDR citizens on the territory of the FRG Embassy in Czechoslovakia. The CTK agency recalls in this connection that in accordance with the requirements of the 1961 Vienna Convention regarding diplomatic missions, the space of diplomatic missions cannot be used in a way which is incompatible with its proper functions, and diplomatic mission establishments do not have the right to grant asylum. Well, in spite of this the FRG is systematically violating the Final Act of the Helsinki European Security and Cooperation Conference, as it does not recognize the GDR's state citizenship, the CTK agency concludes. [video shows station and destination sign saying: Wien Ex Tabor-Velenice 1438; and train passing through station; sign on train says: 375 Vindobona Berlin Dresden-Bad Schandau-Ecin hin Praha Hin-Ceske Velenice-gmund no

Wien Franz-Josefs-Bahnhof; people with bags walking in the night, people unloading passenger car, cemetery]

Soviet Warships To Visit East Germany 5-9 Oct

LD0310235189 Moscow TASS in English 2051 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—Under an agreement reached, a group of warships consisting of the escort ship Bditelny, the large-tonnage anti-submarine ship Silny and a large landing ship under the flag of Admiral Vitaliy Ivanov, commander of the Baltic Fleet, will visit the port of Rostock on an official friendly visit between October 5-9.

Poland's Mazowiecki Thanks Rykhkov for Message

PM0210120189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Polish Premier T. Mazowiecki greetings message: "To Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Prime Minister,

I sincerely thank you for the congratulations of the USSR Council of Ministers and the good wishes in connection with my appointment as chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers.

I reaffirm the fundamental importance of the Polish-Soviet relations of friendship and all-around cooperation for both states' successful development as well as for the stabilization of the situation in Europe and the world. I wholly share the USSR Council of Ministers' view that relations between our states should continue to develop dynamically on the basis of sovereign equality, respect, consideration for mutual interests, and responsibility for the fate of our peoples.

For my part, I also send you very best wishes for successes in implementing the Soviet perestroyka program.

Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers

Rakowski Call for Polish Party Unity Noted

PM0210103189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Threat of a PZPR Split? Speech by M. Rakowski"]

[Text] Warsaw, 28 Sep—I cannot help fearing that in the next few months things could reach the point where several breakaway parties will be formed out of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, stated in a Wednesday speech to party lecturers in connection with the start of the academic year in the party training system. If this happens, he continued, it will mean that we will irrevocably leave the political scene. This is tantamount to a change in our structure, albeit not in our political system. Today we must defend party unity at all costs. If three or four new parties emerge, none of them will be of great importance, the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee stressed.

At the same time, M. Rakowski noted that he sees no opportunity to convene the 11th party congress this year and will insist that this party forum be held in mid-February 1990.

During the discussion there was a prevailing conviction at the meeting of the need to move more quickly along the road to the creation of a renewed party with new statutes and a new program. However, the meeting participants stressed, this cannot mean a complete rejection of the past or the building of a new party on the ruins of the old. Attention was drawn to the danger that left-wing forces would get caught up in ideological discussions, and to the need to invigorate the party. It was also pointed out that some of the voivodship and local apparatus will not be able to implement the PZPR leadership's reform initiatives, which have been approved by the party grassroots.

Rakowski Queried, Says 'Gradual' Reforms Required

PM2909090789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Poland: M. Rakowski Interview"]

[Text] 25 Sep—We wish to revive trust in the party, to transform the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], or some other party which might emerge from the forthcoming 11th congress, into the political force which determines Poland's socialist development.

This was declared by M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, in an interview published today by the newspaper RUDE PRAVO. The path we have chosen can produce the results expected not only by us but also by our friends and allies. If the reforms we have launched are implemented and produce the results expected by society, this will be the most important point.

I would like to say that T. Mazowiecki's new government rejects what we had begun. The reality is that, as from last November, important changes occurred in the concept of economic development in Poland. We adopted a series of progressive laws. Had this not been done, T. Mazowiecki's government would have encountered a much more complex situation than at present. On the other hand, I know that the ministers in the new government cabinet will soon see for themselves that considerable problems have accumulated in Poland and they are impossible to resolve either by rhetoric or by radical measures. The situation prevailing in Poland requires gradual implementation of reforms.

Market Switch Seen Causing Polish Inflation

PM0210125589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Poland: Price Hikes"]

[Text] 27 Sep—Some people are voicing loud indignation and telephoning editorial offices, while others are despondently keeping quiet—those are the symptoms of shock caused by the latest price hikes in Poland...

Today TRYBUNA LUDU reports that milk, curd, and butter prices, for instance, more than doubled in the first few days this week.

The prime cause of this situation, which the Polish press defines as "tremendous chaos in the price sphere," is deemed to be the large-scale operation to transfer the entire food complex to so-called market methods of economic management. In the opinion of the Polish United Workers Party's organ, this operation "lacks consistency and often logic." It was also "free market" forces that enabled, for instance, the peasant producers, citing the latest increase in fuel prices, to demand a sharp increase in milk purchase prices last week and demand that trading firms and cooperatives sell dairy products with arbitrary markups. Moreover, newspapers emphasize that both the hikes and the markups are often "made up."

Poland Awaiting Political, Economic Upturn

PM0310145789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 89 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent A. Starukhin dispatch under the "On the Spot" rubric: "Beset by Problems. Difficult Start for Poland's New Government"]

[Text] Warsaw—Fall in Warsaw is the direct extension of summer: mushroom forays, and at the same time sunshine and summer clothes. However, there is something else not so good—the fall has inherited and even exacerbated all the economic problems that oppressed society during the summer.

Ten days ago a fair amount of fuel was poured in the direct sense of the word on the continually raging fire of passions over prices, which are spiraling upward to some unknown peak. The cost of 1 liter of fuel for light automobiles soared from Z500 to Z750, that is, it passed the R2 mark. Let me remind you that at the beginning of the summer the same gasoline was selling for Z350. Other types of liquid fuel have risen correspondingly. Perhaps the first and most serious reaction—in terms of consequences—to the latest change in price lists at the fuel department came from the individual peasant farmers. They immediately inflated prices for all types of products, primarily meat and milk.

A great many people are speaking and arguing today about the advantages of free market price formation. But can such a market provide the longed-for effect in the conditions of "empty shelves"? If it can, then when? When do the miraculous rules of competition prevail on this market? At any rate, there is hardly anyone here in Poland who will give an intelligible answer to this question.

As was ever the case, optimistic forecasts preceded the innovations. But soon after a particular step was taken, it was rapidly pointed out that the results were lamentable. This happened when the free buying and selling of hard currency was legalized—the rate of the zloty fell sharply. The same has happened now with the introduction of market price formation—a number of basic types of food products have simply become unobtainable for the broad working masses.

It was forecast that the price increase would rouse the peasants to supply the city with considerably more output. But did everything turn out like that? In a report headlined "Milk: Price Shock" TRYBUNA LUDU recently gave Janina Kurkowska, director of the association of trading enterprises in Warsaw's Wola area, the floor. She attests that before the introduction of market mechanisms the stores in this area of the capital required 70,000 liters of skimmed milk a day and the same amount of full-fat milk. Today 40,000 and 25-30,000 liters of milk respectively are being sold.

It seems that the multiple price increases "lull" crop farmers and livestock breeders and enable them to work with much less effort in return for ever-increasing income. There is statistical confirmation of this. Meat procurements have dropped of late in comparison with last year by virtually 28 percent and deliveries of sugar have been halved. If you refer to the food industry as a whole, the shipment of products from its enterprises has fallen by approximately 26 percent.

At the same time many peasants nonetheless believe in the positive results of the planned economic transformations. The inhabitants of a number of the country's rural areas have proposed shipping additional grain consignments to the state, on credit as it were—they have agreed to accept the money for it 1 year later. Loans in the form of grain and meat were proposed by individual peasant farmers from Poznan Voivodship and were supported by a cooperative at Zduny and several more farms on the Baltic coast around Gdansk. I would not be mistaken in saying that all the Polish people are impatient for changes for the better.

Whereas there is a lack of competition on the quiet commodity market today, competition is making itself felt increasingly clearly on the "political market." The second and final part of the 15th Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee Plenum will be held in Warsaw 3 October. The communist party is experiencing a difficult period. Some 23 PZPR deputies recently submitted their own draft to the Sejm for changes to the Polish Constitution. They deem it necessary to remove Article 3 of the fundamental law regarding the PZPR's leading role in the country's life and its permanent coalition with the United Peasant and Democratic Parties. All this by no means corresponds with political reality.

The party and all its links have been deprived of any subsidies whatsoever from the state. The apparatus is being cut back. There is talk of leasing a wing of the party headquarters building in Warsaw to other organizations. An audit of real estate in voivodship centers and below is being carried out. But I consider it more important that Army political directorates and party committees are being disbanded and the militia has found itself "outside the party." The question of closing down party committees at enterprises has been debated to the point of hoarseness. "Solidarity" is demanding that labor collectives be outside politics. They are waiting for a law to be ratified regulating the parties' activity.

The result is confusion, a loss of orientation, and in some areas a timeserving tendency on the part of PZPR members. On being introduced to the collective, A. Drawicz, the newly-appointed chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, stated that he has little interest in who belongs to which party but workers must leave their party cards, that is to say their ideological sympathies, with the porter on entering the committee building.

At all levels of the state and managerial apparatus PZPR representatives are occasionally not merely asked to make room but are even displaced.

The country is biding its time in a ferment. People are living on hope.

Solidarity Action Against PZPR Criticized

PM2909100189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "Trial Balloon?"]

[Text] Warsaw—The euphoria brought about by the political changeover at the helm of the country seems to be wearing off in Poland. Attention is shifting to the harsh realities linked above all with the continuing price race. "We voted for a free Poland but we got free prices," a journalist from the former opposition pointed out despondently. In turn, having become statesmen, the opposition leaders are frequently beginning to think in the same way as the ministers in M. Rakowski's recent government. J. Kuron, for instance, who has taken up the post of minister of labor and social policy, has said that strikers must not be paid for strike time. Yet not so long ago he was demanding the opposite.

Having come to power, "Solidarity" figures are totally unable to come to terms with the fact that they have to officially, by law, coexist with the communists. Not merely coexist, but also cooperate and guide the state machine as one team. It is possible to grasp this rationally, but nothing can tame emotions and the old enmity. Of course, some people would like to eliminate the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] altogether and wipe it off the face of the earth. But there are certain gentlemen's agreements that they made together at the "roundtable," on the initiative, moreover, of the very party whose policy initiated the reform process.

But that is life. Politicians' intentions are ultimately judged on their achievements. This happened several days ago at the "Kazimierz-Juliusz" Mine in Sosnowica. The "Solidarity" trade union grassroots organization here suddenly mounted a campaign to collect signatures for the following petition: "I, the undersigned, demand the immediate removal from the mine of the PZPR committee and also an end to the practice of financing the party aktiv and its youth organization from enterprise funds. At the same time I state that I do not oppose members of the party and the Polish Socialist Youth League."

An extremely insidious document. First, it involves all working people in an adventurist action in order to later cite their wishes. Second, it strikes the sore point of material benefits: Party committee leaders are on the mine's payroll, that is, they receive money we have earned by the sweat of our brow. Third, we are not totally opposed to party members, we only refuse to allow a PZPR organization to be based at the enterprise and engage in political activity, since the desire to depoliticize the economy is being advanced everywhere. Even dozens of militiamen from Pekary-Slaskie handed in an application to leave the party, supposedly to please their minister, who had voiced the idea of freeing the department from ideology under the new conditions.

Demagoguery is always dangerous. Especially if it bears some semblance of truth. Moreover, "Solidarity" members repeat that they do not want to offend communists, they only want the party committee not to be located on the mine's grounds.

The mine director was issued with an ultimatum: You must determine your position on the question of the party committee's expulsion by 1400 hours tomorrow. Director A. Stacha replied: The party committee first secretary is paid his wages by the PZPR Voivodship Committee, while the two other secretaries perform their duties on a voluntary basis, that is, without payment. Thus there are no violations of the laws.

A convincing answer? Without doubt. But everything indicates that this was not of very great interest to those who initiated the adventure. They already knew how a party worker is paid for his work and by whom. They refused to give way. More than 3,000 signatures had been collected (out of 4,800 workers).

Secretaries of all primary party organizations were forced to sign a complaint addressed to T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers. It is unheard of for the party itself not to decide the question of eliminating the party organ at the mine. The "referendum" was illegal since it was organized not by the mine's labor council, but by the trade union.

However, the trade union activists had recourse to an act of violence. They evicted communists from the party committee's premises and sealed them up. As M. Januszko, the most zealous of them, said, "our government headed by our premier now exists to ensure that no one can disobey it."

M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, drove out to the scene of the emergency, which illustrates the relapse into anarchy and the complete absence of political culture among "Solidarity" grassroots members. Together with M. Gorywoda, member of the Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Katowice Voivodship Party Committee, he held a meeting in Sosnowica with PZPR members. The debate was trenchant and stormy. Its participants concluded that the incident at the "Kazimierz-Juliusz" Mine was a blatant attempt to test the party in the new situation. How would it behave? Is it weak or is there still life in the old dog? The mine at Sosnowica, indisputably, was a kind of political proving ground where the tactics of "Solidarity's" extremist forces, which are reviving the old idea of eliminating the party at enterprises, were tested out.

Nonetheless, "Solidarity" did force the party committee to leave the mine management building.

"The attack on your party committee," M. Rakowski told the miners, "constituted an attack on the entire party. The party with which 'Solidarity' resolved to set up a government and jointly bear responsibility for everything done in our country. We will fight, we must fight."

What did the first attack by unfriendly forces on the party reveal? The PZPR, while transforming itself, must be prepared for political battles. Having lost its former office-bound comfort, it is now trying to become a militant party. No one is giving any guarantees that the first attack will not be followed by others.

Adam Michnik Interviewed on Polish Changes

PM0210192189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 89 p 3

[Interview with GAZETA WYBORCZA Chief Editor Adam Michnik by special correspondent Aleksandr Drozdov under the "First-Hand" rubric: "'I Am Opposed to The Magical Power of Words.' In 1980 He Was Known As the 'Most Sinister Figure of the Polish Counterrevolution.' Now He Represents the Authorities in Poland. His Name Is Adam Michnik"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] On the eve of the interview I looked through some old newspapers. Nine years ago you didn't need a full palette to draw a political sketch of Poland, just the two or three colors that you find in a small schoolboy's tin box of paints would have been enough. The concept of socialist internationalism "a la Brezhnev" required primarily crimson tones for the background.

But the genie of class approaches released from that small tin box threatened to fill our Soviet collection of ideological trophies with "Polish" ones, too. Our scientists like to do things on the grand scale—classes, systems, formations—and count in millions. The only thing that I don't understand is where they mislaid the 10 million Poles who joined "Solidarity?" They preferred to ignore them and focused all their attention on the group of leaders whom we now call "informal." And it is only from today's vantage point that we have the right to evaluate "Solidarity" as an example of the rebirth of working people's spontaneous activity, an example unprecedented in the second half of the 20th century. But the question is—what is "Solidarity" today, after its election victory? Our special correspondent Aleksandr Drozdov now talks about that and other problems of present-day Poland with Adam Michnik, chief editor of GAZETA WYBORCZA and "Solidarity" theoretician.

[Drozdov] Briefly and without resorting to the traditional conceptual apparatus, Adam, how would you explain the essence of the political model which the new authorities are preparing for Poland? And does that model exist within "Solidarity?" Your opponents claim that a detailed program hasn't been worked out yet...

[Michnik] The essence of the political model in the country will be the broad and historically significant compromise among all the participants in the political process.

Now for the claim that "Solidarity" doesn't have a constructive, concrete program. That is both true and false. It is true because we haven't said anything specific about what needs to be done with the coal industry, the chemical industry, and so forth. But it is false because in our position as the opposition we simply couldn't have a constructive program. For example, they used to say the same in our country about all the critics of the system. If a contemporary leader had said what he thought about Chernenko or Brezhnev he would have been making a "very critical" comment. Furthermore, that would have been characterized as a destructive viewpoint, it would have been called antisocialist and so on, as they used to say about us at one time.

[Drozdov] And now such a program exists...

[Michnik] I would call this the philosophy of the transition from a totalitarian regime to democracy. Prime Minister Mazowiecki tried to expound that in his maiden speech in parliament. But he gave only a general picture because in the whole world there isn't a single country which has chosen the path which Poland has taken. Do you know what is going to happen with the republics and with market relations in your country? ...Obviously you only know that there is no going back to the Brezhnev administrative-edict system. We know that, too. But what will there be? Specifically? We don't know. We know that we want democracy and pluralism. The market economy and profitability of enterprises. Social justice. But these are just slogans. Their implementation is a social and economic policy problem, a problem of political reform. But these are very concrete and complex matters and we will have to examine them in very concrete terms. For example, take the principle of parliamentary elections. This problem is the subject of much debate—in both your country and ours. We could simply say: There is no problem! There must be democratic elections! And there are people in our country who do say that. But we were cautious. Why? Because we know that if we want evolution we have to take care over its continuation. And if it is a question of continuation it was very important for us to have a rapprochement with the reformist wing of the ruling camp and not a frontal conflict.

[Drozdov] I recall that before the elections "Solidarity" Chairman Lech Walesa said that "Solidarity's" historic role at this stage is to bring the country to pluralism and ensure after the elections opportunities for the creation of political parties. At that point, as I recall his comment, "Solidarity" would consider that it had generally fulfilled its political role in the country—I emphasize its political role, the role of a party—and thereafter there would be normal political life and the emergence of many parties. In your view, Pan Redaktor, when should we expect parties to emerge from within "Solidarity" and would that mean that "Solidarity" as an entity would cease to exist?

[Michnik] This is a very complex question. In our country now there is a discussion about the nature of "Solidarity" as a sociopolitical movement: a confederation of the entire opposition or a movement with specific political and ideological characteristics? It all hangs on the answer to that question. In my view it is necessary now to organize a "Solidarity" citizens' movement. However, I know that there are other opinions. For example, if they were to ask me what my political position is, I would answer—"Solidarity." But in "Solidarity" there are people who would answer differently. They reply: "My political position is neoliberal, or Catholic democrat, or social democrat." What is closer to the truth? Simply none of us knows that yet. I'll ask you a question—what, politically speaking, is the interregional group in the USSR Supreme Soviet? Will its members have some common civic stance in the future?

[Drozdov] I think that one already exists...

[Michnik] There you are then... But you will not find a single traditional category to define them—they aren't bolsheviks, mensheviks, or cadets—this is something new...

[Drozdov] Totally new...

[Michnik] It is exactly the same with us. And the same in Czechoslovakia with Charter-77, for instance. There are people with different traditions there. But when they came together they built something new for which there simply were no traditional categories. As for the Walesa statements that you cited, I think that for him it was very important to preserve a certain opposition unity before the elections. And therefore the "Solidarity" ticket was open to all. Once again he was right and at the same time wrong. Right, because the "Solidarity" ticket won a crushing victory. Wrong, because every major "Solidarity" candidate also had a competitor among the opposition.

[Drozdov] We are still very interested in the question of strategy and tactics—the tactical, immediate aims which we have already spoken about and "Solidarity's" vision of the future. In particular, we are of course interested in the new government's approach to relations with the Soviet Union. But situations change and tactics must change with them, and 3 months ago you were perhaps the only man in "Solidarity" who could have imagined that "Solidarity" would be able to form its own government so quickly. In any event, GAZETA WYBORCZA did not discuss that prior to the elections. "Solidarity" didn't set itself the goal of forming its own government after the elections...

[Michnik] Yes. That is right.

[Drozdov] In other words, tactics had to change. So for me this is a very important question—the Polish position on relations with the Soviet Union as stated by the new prime minister, may that not also change if "Solidarity" adopts new tactics? Does it meet Poland's vital interests, as we see them?

[Michnik] I feel somewhat awkward answering that question because I shall be forced to talk about myself. When I was in prison (I got out in the summer of 1986) I was firmly convinced that something very important was going on in your country. And I came out of prison with that confidence.

It was clear to us that you have to begin by explaining to "Solidarity" people that the opposition's suspicion of everything going on in the Soviet Union is mistaken and wrong because the consequences of the de-Stalinization in the Soviet Union are exclusively positive. This process has no negative consequences. In other words, the success of the policy connected with the name Gorbachev is in the sphere of Polish national interests. In this question we were good futurologists. No one doubts that in Poland now.

There is no question of the attitude toward the changes taking place in your country formulated by Prime Minister Mazowiecki having been dictated by short-term considerations. It is a deeply considered policy. It is connected with how we understand Polish and European interests. We are faced by the question: How should central and Eastern Europe appear after de-Stalinization? The order constructed by Stalin (I do not mean the borders) cannot be preserved. The question is: What should the new system look like?

As a preliminary rough answer I would say that I am for a sovereign, independent Poland which will observe its alliance commitments, including within the Warsaw Pact framework. When I visited the Ukraine recently I told my Ukrainian friends that I am for a sovereign, democratic confederation within whose framework there will be room for the sovereignty of each people. This is an antiseparatist position, not a separatist one. Our situation is different from that of the Ukrainians and the Russians. Let me be precise. If we maintain and continue to maintain relations with national movements in Lithuania, Belorussia, or the Ukraine, those initiatives should not be regarded as anti-Russian. These are our neighbors and it would be incomprehensible if we were to maintain with Moscow the relations that we wanted to have with it now and in the future and at the same time did not have with Kiev, Vilnius, or Minsk the relations that we wanted now and in the future. I simply think that in post-Stalin central and Eastern Europe there will be a place for all our nations and we should all be thinking together now about the model of our international relations that we should develop. The question is: Either, or. Either we manage to elaborate a model of coexistence which will more or less resemble Western Europe (for example, relations between France and Germany, Italy and Austria, and so on), or our region will become a hell of national conflicts.

[Drozdov] Are you sure that we will cope with that task?

[Michnik] Dialogue, dialogue, once more dialogue—that, it seems to me, is what meets the interests of Poles, Russians, and Ukrainians equally. It is just that to achieve this we must conquer our Polish chauvinism, you must overcome your Russian chauvinism, the Ukrainians must rid themselves of their Ukrainian chauvinism, and so forth. So far, it seems to me, we have spoken as though in parallel without addressing one another. At the moment this is not dialogue but a series of monologues. This may result in either dialogue or cacophony. I support dialogue. This is a difficult path but there is simply no other way. Any other path means a conflict of chauvinisms.

And if chauvinism wins in my country or in yours, that will be the end of democracy. In Poland now there are people who consider this viewpoint anti-Polish. In Russia there are people who will say that only a Russophobe can think that way. In the Ukraine, too, there are people who will say that only a turncoat could talk like that. All this is untrue. The truth is that you can love your people and work for them only by creating good relations with other peoples. You cannot build anything on the basis of national hatred. But I think that it is clear from what I have said that the attitude toward the peoples of the USSR expressed in Mazowiecki's speech is deeply considered and well reasoned. To be entirely accurate there is one short-term factor which lends meaning to that idea—that is perestroyka. In the Brezhnev era these would have been empty slogans. That is what I think. That is our newspaper's line.

[Drozdov] At the very beginning you spoke about a great compromise for Poland. The forecast was borne out. Now the country, or at least the present government, intends to follow a path of evolution. I have been considering the following idea: Evolution is a very calm, albeit persistent, process, but doesn't it seem to you that the time factor is very important now because something very unexpected could happen which could quickly prevent evolution?

[Michnik] I would say this: Evolution means primarily the rejection of coercion. Second, if we are talking about the time factor, it is strongest not in the economic sphere but in the political sphere. What can I say about that? That we were in a situation where there was no choice. If we hadn't chosen that path now, we would have been forced to take it in 6 months' time in a far more complex situation. Now we have a government which enjoys public support such as no Polish Government since 1945 has had.

[Drozdov] However, there are another 40 percent of Poles who simply did not take part in the vote. What is their viewpoint?

[Michnik] It is very difficult to answer that question.

[Drozdov] There is probably always a passive section of the electorate...

[Michnik] However, it was considerably larger than we expected.

[Drozdov] So what can get in your way?

[Michnik] In general terms there are two potentially harmful processes here. First, bad economic and social policy. First and foremost it is necessary to win people's support. This policy may be difficult, but if people know that this is the right path they will support it. That is the way forward. The path may be difficult and complex, but if I know that by taking this path I'll get to the top I'll have the strength to go on. But if I can see for myself every minute of the day that I am not going in that direction, not going to the top but down into the abyss, I won't want to go on. And the second thing that may stop us would be the defeat of perestroyka in your country. If the conservative wing triumphs in your country that may condemn us, too. The success of this government was possible thanks to two factors. First, it was approved by the leadership of the ruling camp, which chose the path of reforms (Jaruzelski and Rakowski), and, even though I have my own reservations, this has to be acknowledged.

The final speech by the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee's first secretary, Rakowski, was very interesting. It voiced the idea of an association of the country's reform-minded circles. There is something worth discussing here. And the second factor was that this was the first time we heard kind words from Moscow instead of threats. From the standpoint of the future of Polish-Soviet relations this is also a crucial point. Perhaps we have now embarked on a path whereby all the bad things in our relations in the past will be canceled. Furthermore, there is another factor at work here. Our peoples are facing identical tasks—to rid themselves of Stalinism and build a system which meets the demands of life. You hear the opinion expressed that this must be a capitalist system. I find that absurd. On this social soil you cannot build a system which is the product of a completely different social reality. I believe that the language of our conversations must be free of such mumbo jumbo as: Are you for socialism or for capitalism? They hold a gun to your head and demand a plain answer. You cannot talk in those terms. I do not know what it means to be "for socialism" or "for capitalism" nowadays. I really don't know. I know very well what I am against but I would like to talk in specific terms, very specific terms about all the rest. The cult of the word "privatization" has arisen in certain circles in Poland now. What does this mean? What should be privatized? The railroads, the aircraft? This is nonsense, drivel. This is just another ideological "panacea," mumbo jumbo.

Privatization, just like socialization, is a totally meaningless word. We must adopt the formula that there is no miraculous model now which needs only to be implemented (where necessary—by force) to work. We must now allow a pluralism of forms of ownership and forms of economic management and then see which one wins. For example, why private ownership and not cooperatives? Why private enterprises and not self-managing ones?

Second, in Poland—and not only in Poland but in Hungary and to some extent in your country, too—people use the magic word "market." Magic word! Sure, the market solves many problems but not all of them. The market will not solve all the problems and our world is arranged so badly that when one set of problems is resolved others take its place. The market has its problems, too.

What will we do about unemployment? We say this: The market is necessary because it will enable people's energy, enterprise, and creativity to be released. OK, but what if some people do not have a creative nature? Does that mean that they have to starve to death on the street? No, we cannot accept that. I am against all solutions based on a single doctrinal remedy. There is no such remedy. There are different remedies and each has its own merits and shortcomings. I would like to make another point here. I am increasingly becoming convinced that the classic "divisions" will not be reproduced in our country. For example, the division between right and left. This is the product of a bourgeois revolution, the French Revolution. Instead, the divisions which will occur in our country are the products of an antitotalitarian process, and that is simply another process. The divisions here will be different... We simply must realize that we are living in a new era which we ourselves at the moment can neither understand nor name. Only one thing can be said with confidence—never before has so much depended on us ourselves as now. And in this sense we alone will decide what we shall bequeath to our children: The kind of world in which we want to live or the kind which we want to leave.

[Drozdov] There is a struggle between different types of thinking in progress. In the language of classical philosophy the first can be called dialectical thinking. And doctrinal thinking, also classical in its way, which was elaborated in a very lengthy historical context, Stalinist thinking. The problem is: What is to happen to that vast group of people who, because of their social position, education, or some other factor, cannot change their thinking. As I understand it, the option which you propose—the great historical compromise—gives some guarantees to the old type of thinking. The question centers surely not on changing it, especially not by force, but of giving it the opportunity to live and fade away.

The critics of perestroyka have very precisely expressed such a concern not for the fate of socialism but for themselves. For some people this is not simply a sense of fear for their physical safety, though that would have been understandable. For those who profess this type of thinking because of their position in the administration, for example, this is also a matter of preserving power. There is a dilemma here, I think. On the one hand, the autonomous existence of an enclave of doctrinal thinking is possible. But isn't it possible that at some moment this enclave, this spiritual niche will renounce that prospect and try to recover its right to doctrinal thinking by force? Will the "great compromise" guard against that?

[Michnik] Let us be clear here, in my view the answer is no.

I would put it like this: There is no place for Nina Andreyeva in such a compromise, that is, no place in the system of power. We do not want to guillotine our conservatives, to imprison them, and so on, but there is no place for them in the system of power.

What is to be done with those who will not compromise? They will have to leave the system of power but they will be protected. For us this is a question of internal reform. There will be a conflict in each country, in the party, in our country and in yours.

Let us wait and see whether I am a good futurologist or not. Much of what I have said comes from the realms of political prognosis. But just 4 years ago who could have imagined that your press and television would look the way they do now. Thanks to the changes in your country, all anti-Soviet demagoguery in Poland becomes pointless.

But what could reinforce anti-Sovietism is pro-Soviet servility, that is, the unnecessary obsequiousness of the Polish press. The excesses in Krakow do not meet with the people's support, this is not a mass popular movement.

Anti-Soviet jargon is grotesque, it has nothing to do with real life. The USSR's statement that the building of a new Poland is a matter for the Poles themselves was of tremendous significance for Poland.

[Drozdov] How will "Solidarity" react to strikes if they continue despite the moratorium which, as is well known, the government may announce?

[Michnik] This is a question of the disposition of forces. If we are going to pursue a policy in the interests of the majority of society, the minority will not influence the situation.

If a government manages to achieve an understanding of the sacrifice that is necessary today, that will be a breakthrough but no cause for euphoria. There is a sober realization that nothing is going to change overnight. Thus there must be more patience. But that isn't so terrible if you are on a road which can lead you out of the impasse.

Polish Government Keeps Mum on Anti-USSR Demos

PM0210161989 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Sep 89 p 3

[Own correspondent Yu. Skvortsov dispatch under the rubric "Rejoinder": "Incomprehensible Silence"]

[Text] Warsaw, 28 Sep—Anti-Soviet demonstrations in Poland have become more frequent. Two dates in September—the 50th anniversary of the start of World War II (1 September) and the 50th anniversary of the entry of Soviet troops into the western Ukraine and western Belorussia (17 September)—were used as an excuse by certain forces. Newspapers, magazines, the radio, and the TV, have been full of phrases such as: "the double aggression against Poland," "the fourth partition of Poland," and "the two predators." Fascist Germany and the Soviet Union are thus placed on a par, as it were. The subsequent events of the war—particularly the fact that Polish-Soviet brotherhood in arms emerged and more than half a million Soviet soldiers perished on Polish soil, paying that price to liberate it from fascism—these "details" were mentioned quite rarely.

Needless to say, Poles who lived through the war and can remember its progress were less affected by such propaganda. But the younger generation has suffered from its unambiguous ideological and emotional impact. And some young people have taken action. On 17 September Poland was hit by a wave of anti-Soviet demonstrations and rallies. Extremist youth groups swarmed around the Soviet Embassy in Warsaw, marched through Krakow, and held rallies outside the USSR Consulates in Szczecin and Katowice. The chanting and slogans on the banners did not, as a rule, concern historical events: "Soviets go home!", "Down with communism!" At a rally in Lublin somebody, however, did recall the war and demanded that the monument to the Soviet liberator servicemen in the city be removed...

I personally have no doubt about the opinion of the broad masses of Poles on these, to put it mildly, hooligan incidents. The overwhelming majority of Poles very clearly differentiate socialism and Stalinism, and can tell the difference between the difficult periods in mutual relations between our countries and the many years of traditional friendship between our peoples. Not sham friendship but real friendship.

However, the attitude toward the anti-Soviet demonstrations taken by the current Polish Government and by the leaders of certain political forces in the country is, at the very least, confusing. Lech Walesa, the head of "Solidarity," has many times supported our perestroyka in public and clearly formulated his desire to support normal good-neighborly relations with the USSR. But the "Solidarity" leaders have found neither the time nor the words to condemn those who in the spring and summer of this year defiled the graves of Soviet soldiers in Krakow and Sopot and the other day openly and brazenly (for the militia did not intervene in the course of events) sneered at our state symbols. Or perhaps they were unwilling to condemn them?

The new Polish Government declared at the start of this month that it intends to maintain the best possible relations with both East and West, and that it is perfectly well aware of the importance of normal business ties between the USSR and Poland. However, this propaganda whirlwind with its clearly anti-Soviet bias with regard to two historic dates in September has in no way been assessed by the government. Admittedly, directly before 17 September A. Hall, minister for contacts with social organizations and political parties, called for demonstrations to be held in a peaceful and calm manner. His appeal was ignored. But following 17 September nobody has summed up the results of the "jubilee events" on behalf of the government.

Is it any surprise in the wake of this that on the very next Sunday—24 September—a group of extremists in Gdansk again hoisted anti-Soviet banners overhead without any historical pretext.

Poles are great patriots. And there is no doubt that if anti-Polish demonstrations were to be held in Moscow, Minsk, Leningrad, or Lvov involving the burning of the national flag and the chanting of insults and threats with regard to their Western neighbor these events would have seriously alarmed all Poland. But there simply cannot be and could not be any such demonstrations in the Soviet Union. Our friendly feelings toward the Polish people do not change depending on dates on the calendar, whatever they may remind people of.

And we would very much like to hope that in Poland, too, words of friendship with us will not only be voiced from lofty rostrums but also reaffirmed by actions in those cases when such actions are necessary.

Poles Urged To Forget 'Ancient Grievances'

PM0210143189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 89 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Shutkevich article under the "Phone Call to the Editorial Office" rubric: "Firecrackers on the Other Side of the Fence"—first two paragraphs are a reader's letter]

[Excerpts] "I was very concerned to read a few days ago a statement by the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee and the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR, published in your newspaper, about growing anti-Soviet feelings among a section of Polish young people. And I was actually planning to travel to Warsaw, having been invited there by some people I know... So, what is actually happening there? How serious is all this? I would like to know about it in more detail.
"L. Vorobyeva, Moscow."

Warsaw—[Passage omitted] Where does our anxiety originate? Are we not exaggerating the importance of isolated events? "Anti-Soviet groups in Poland do not represent a political force of even the slightest importance," was the opinion I heard expressed a few days ago by Adam Michnik, a leading "Solidarity" politician and chief editor of GAZETA WYBORCZA. "This is in no way a mass movement." Of course, my interlocutor admitted that there are people in Poland who have hostile feelings toward our country, but after all, not all people in the Soviet Union share the same love for Poland... Here it is important to put everything in perspective, A. Michnik emphasized. In his opinion, anti-Soviet demagoguery loses all meaning in the conditions of the changes occurring in the Soviet Union.

I think that we can accept this. Honestly speaking, I would not have brought up last Sunday's events, had it not been for two factors which worry me. First: It is already obvious that, in the next few months, T. Mazowiecki's government will come up against considerable economic difficulties, and they can be overcome only with the help of tough measures. And this means, A. Michnik admitted, that the possibility of a social explosion with unpredictable consequences cannot be ruled out. It is quite probable that anti-Soviet groups, which do not represent "a political force of even the slightest importance" in Poland today, will try to gain maximum advantage from the situation to expand their influence on young people and on Polish society as a whole.

The second factor, which worries me personally much more than isolated actions by extremists, is the social background to these actions, the opinion of the Soviet Union which is now being shaped by many Polish mass media. Let me say this bluntly: Clearly negative evaluations have recently prevailed toward our country. "Whereas formerly any criticism of the Soviet Union was perceived here as a sign of a civic stance, now it takes great courage to say a good word about it," one of my Warsaw acquaintances sadly remarked. It is difficult to even count the critical barbs fired at the "eastern neighbor" in connection with the 50th anniversary of the signing of the "Ribbentrop-Molotov" pact and the "joint Soviet-German aggression against Poland in 1939." Precisely so: Accusations of aggression are, more often than not, leveled against the "eastern neighbor," the Soviet Union in other words, rather than against the "aggressive-totalitarian Stalinist system" which had taken hold on its territory, and from which it itself suffered much earlier and much more than others.

Is it surprising, therefore, that suspicion of such a "neighbor" is having an effect in our time? "We are also in favor of friendship with the Soviet Union," I was told in Krakow by members of the "Wolnosc i Pokoj" Students' Organization, demanding complete withdrawal of Soviet units from Poland's territory. "But friendship cannot be built on fear." I fully agree. But the same can also be said by hundreds of Soviet families here, in Warsaw, who await the next tragic anniversary date, 28 September, with great anxiety. Let me remind readers: It was on this day, exactly 50 years ago, that the Soviet-German Treaty on Borders and Friendship was signed. It will be followed by the next anniversary of the tragic Katyn massacre... So, what is to happen—should our compatriots in Warsaw simply carry on, living in a state of constant alarm? This is hardly likely to promote the cause of friendship between our countries. And is trust between the neighbor-peoples likely to be strengthened by the map of prewar Poland, recently printed on the entire front page of the Catholic weekly LAD under a sentimentally elegiac headline: "The Way It Was..."

Yes, that was the way it was. And the feeling of oppressive grief and nostalgia for the places of their youth which grips some elderly Poles when looking at Lvov or Vilnius is humanly understandable and touching. But Poland was also different. As a reader recently remarked in the weekly WALKA MLODYCH, "Wroclaw, Olsztyn, Slupsk, and a number of other cities were outside its territory... This map gives no indication that 60 percent of the inhabitants of Ternopol Voivodship were Ukrainians, that the Polish-Lithuanian border at the time was dubbed 'bleeding,' that Polish policemen in the eastern marches were perceived as symbols of a foreign, almost occupying power, that Belorussians were denied the right to call themselves a people..."

Today it is sufficient to re-read what was written on this subject by Zeromski and Nalkowska, who rang the alarm bell about the "pacification" of non-Polish villages, the destruction of orthodox churches, and the grievances inflicted on the indigenous inhabitants of those lands. None of this is to be found on the map, but it all happened... Is it in any way surprising that the calls made at a young people's demonstration for the "return of the eastern marches"—Brest, Lvov, and Vilnius—to "Mother Poland" do not generate any enthusiasm among neighbors on the other bank of the Bug, but revive altogether different sentiments and memories?

Tragic dates and pages cannot be erased from the people's memory. The further they recede into the past, the more painfully and the more often they resurface, just like fragments embedded in the flesh, appearing years later. I am convinced that we have still not emptied our bitter cup of repentance, and the feeling of shame for some deeds by our forebears will still, time and again, make us blush... But why should vengeance for these dates and pages be exacted from our contemporaries, making them worried and uncertain about the future? Why should the people's memory of the tragic past, which is silently mournful by nature, increasingly often take the form of screaming and noisy demonstrations? After all, if the same logic were to be applied, our country should commemorate in the same fashion the march of King Stefan Batory's troops on Pskov, Ivan Susanin's death, and the massacre of a peaceful demonstration by Belorussian peasants at Kossovo-Polesskoye in 1927... It is well known that blood and suffering cannot be quantified. A completely different measure is applied there—kindness and charity.

In my view, it was very correctly said by someone: History is a beacon which shines from the past and illuminates the future. It is very important to ensure that neither the fissures of ancient grievances, nor the cobwebs of ossified ideas, nor tenacious, obsolete lies should distort its rays for posterity.

USSR, Polish Historians Discuss World War II

PM0310134989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Report by Colonel A. Orlov, candidate of historical sciences: "Historians Confer"]

[Text] A 2-day scientific conference involving Polish and Soviet military historians discussing problems relating to the beginning of World War II has been held at the USSR Defense Ministry Institute of Military History. These problems which date back 50 years are still at the center of the public's attention in Poland and the Soviet Union. The conference was organized by the Polish Information and Culture Center in the USSR, the Polish Institute of Military History, and the USSR Defense Ministry Institute of Military History. The conference heard reports from Polish military historians M. Klimecki, T. Paniecki, and K. Sobczak and, on the Soviet side, from D.A. Volkogonov, V.O. Daynes, and Yu.Ya. Kirshin.

The reports and speeches by conference participants examined various aspects of the events of August-September 1939 in the light of new archive materials.

Unity of views was reached on the majority of the questions discussed at the conference. Substantial differences appeared in the sides' views on a number of aspects relating mainly to events after 17 September 1939 when the Red Army entered Polish territory. The general opinion was that there must be further close cooperation between the two countries' historians to establish the truth. Note was made of the usefulness of such meetings, which make it possible to considerably advance the study of the history of Soviet-Polish relations and to clarify many episodes of the initial stage of World War II.

Hungary's Grosz Assesses Party Developments

LD0310181189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with Karoly Grosz, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, MSZMP, by correspondent Yevgeniy Shirokov, in Budapest on 3 October; Grosz speaks in Hungarian with superimposed Russian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Shirokov] Comrade Grosz, of late there have been some big changes both in the MSZMP and in general in the political life in Hungary. How do you appraise the situation at the present time before the congress?

[Grosz] All members of the party have great expectations of the congress. There is much at stake. It is a question of in which direction the MSZMP's policy will develop. On the one hand, this will determine the fate of the renewal of socialism in Hungary as well. On the other hand, the question of whether the party is maintained as a single party or whether it will break up in several directions should also be decided. It is very important what answers the MSZMP congress gives to these questions. A considerable number of our communists have lost their orientation, and are in a state of confusion. And their trust in the party will depend precisely on the progress made at the Congress and on providing a clear answer. I am not talking about their trust in socialism because in this respect there can be no doubt. But the party should personify and express their will, their striving, their idea of the future destiny of Hungary. The course the discussion takes, the differences in standpoints, testify to the fact that excessive passions are raging within the party; there is quite some mudslinging. The theoretical standpoints have not been defined precisely and completely. These should serve as the basis for the further renewal and development of the party and of socialism in Hungary. The program that will be discussed points to a renewal of this type. At the present time, it is, of course, difficult to predict the results of implementing this program. This will largely depend on the leadership that the congress elects; that is, it depends on the personality factor—whether the party, the left- wing party of the communist and workers' movement—is preserved or whether it will take a step to the right, which may have tragic consequences for Hungary.

[Shirokov] It is known that in the course of the discussion views which are, let's say, remote from socialism are being expressed. There are also anti-Soviet manifestations. What is your attitude toward this?

[Grosz] Yes, of late we have, with increasing frequency, been coming up against intensified anticommunist, anti-socialist, and anti-Soviet pronouncements. I think that it won't be long—in the immediate future if the situation does not change—before there will also be manifestations of antisemitism and other nationalistic views. This is an indication of the insufficiently effective disclosure of the principles of socialism in society, which has an impact not only on our national interests but on universal interests as well. We, communists, proceed from the interests of all countries and should resolutely act to combat such manifestations. Hungary will not find a place for itself in the world unless it regulates and renews its relations with the socialist countries, first and foremost with the Soviet Union.

Yazov Sends Greetings to Hungary's Karpati

PM0310151789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Sep 89 First Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Minister Army General D. Yazov undated greetings message to Hungarian Defense Minister Colonel General F. Karpati on Hungarian Armed Forces Day]

[Text] To Comrade Colonel General Ferenc Karpati, defense minister of the Hungarian People's Republic

Esteemed Comrade Minister!
Personally and on behalf of the USSR Armed Forces I send you and all Hungarian servicemen combat greetings and cordial congratulations on Hungarian Armed Forces Day.

Our armies' combat cooperation makes an important contribution to strengthening the defensive alliance of the Warsaw Pact states. Celebrating this jubilee together with you, servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces voice firm determination unswervingly to strengthen friendship and all-around cooperation with their Hungarian brothers in arms for the good of our countries' peoples.

I wish the personnel of the Hungarian People's Army further successes in improving their combat skill in the interests of strengthening the defense capability of the Hungarian People's Republic and the entire socialist community.

Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

Hungary's MSZMP Party Plenum Concludes 25 Sep

Topics of Discussion Noted

PM2909091989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Plenum Ends"]

[Text] Budapest, 25 Sep—A plenum of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Central Committee, chaired by MSZMP Chairman R. Nyers, ended here today.

The published information report on its results points out that the plenum participants discussed and approved a draft of the Central Committee's report to the forthcoming party congress. The MSZMP Central Committee discussed the party's draft program declaration and recommended it for discussion and approval by the congress. Questions of technical and organizational preparations for the congress were examined.

The Central Committee heard a report on the tripartite political talks to coordinate interests and approved the MSZMP delegation's work at these talks. It was pointed out in this context that the agreement reached at the talks constitutes a significant step toward a peaceful transition serving the country's future. For its part, the MSZMP will make every effort to implement this agreement.

The plenum participants discussed a draft resolution on national reconciliation which, together with other documents, will be submitted for discussion by the congress.

Program Debates Reported

PM2909103589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch: "Split or Compromise?"]

[Text] Budapest, 26 Sep—Will the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] arrive at a unified platform for renewal? This is not an idle question just before its forthcoming working congress. Arguments continue over the drafts of the MSZMP program declaration and statutes which are due to be adopted.

The draft MSZMP program declaration is perceived by most party members as merely a basis for discussion. The MSZMP's objective as proclaimed in the documents—democratic socialism—should be implemented in the new conditions of the functioning of the people's power. Many people also speak of changing the party model. Whereas representatives of MSZMP reformist circles [kruzhkov reform] advocate its post-congress transformation into a leftwing organization along the lines of Western social-democratic parties, representatives of the united Marxist platform and the Ferenc Muennich Society are demanding that the MSZMP remain a party founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninsim, internationalism, and a class character.

The new MSZMP statutes are geared to the task of furthering the party's adaptation to the conditions of multiparty parliamentary democracy. Opinions differ also on this draft.

Judging by statements made by a number of MSZMP leaders, they are hoping to avoid a split and reach compromises in the weeks remaining between now and the congress. The draft program declaration was recommended for discussion and adoption by the congress at the MSZMP Central Committee plenum held a few days ago. Aiming for unity of actions and the strengthening of the masses' trust, the MSZMP advocates national reconciliation and consolidation of forces.

Differing Views of Party's Future

PM0210124989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Correspondent F. Lukyanov dispatch: "Hungarian Socialist Workers Party: Against a Split"]

[Text] Budapest—The preparations for the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] congress, which opens 6 October, have entered the final stage. The city and megye party conferences are over, having elected the congress delegates. In all, 1,276 delegates have undergone strict precongress selection over the past weeks. The fact that the selection was really strict and took place according to the most modern criteria is indicated, for example, by the fact that 5 of the 21 members of the quite recently created MSZMP Political Executive Committee were not elected congress delegates, and more than two-thirds of the members of the Central Committee formed in May 1988 were not elected....

The final chord of the election campaign was struck by the conference of the MSZMP's Budapest organization, which unites 150,000 communists—that is, 20 percent of party members. How is the party to be made a truly modern political force meeting today's requirements? How is its shaken prestige with the people to be restored and safeguarded against a possible split? These questions were probably of the greatest concern to the delegates at the capital's party conference. After a prolonged and stormy debate lasting 14 hours a resolution pointing out that the upcoming congress must be a congress of the party's renewal and draw up a political and preelection program—a program for overcoming the crisis in the party and in society—was adopted by a majority of votes.

The delegates devoted special attention to the problem of the MSZMP's unity, given the existence within it of different platforms and trends. A majority of the 437 conference participants resolutely advocated preserving party unity and said that the new rules, which it is planned to adopt at the congress, must guarantee the necessary representation of workers' interests. A poll conducted at the conference also showed that the majority of delegates adhere to the viewpoint that there is no need to change the party's name (many representatives of reformist trends are demanding the removal of the word "workers" from the name).

The last megye meetings of communists to nominate delegates were held practically simultaneously with the conference in Budapest. MSZMP Chairman Rezso Nyers declared at the conference in Pest Megye that the party is going through a complex period, although the "critical point," in his opinion, is already past. By rejecting extremes on both flanks it is possible to form a party which will advance along a new path, while not denying the accumulated things of value. Touching on the question of the party's activity at work places, which is currently the subject of heated debate, Rezso Nyers pointed out that to pull out of enterprises now, at the time of the election campaign (meaning the upcoming parliamentary election—F.L.), would have grave consequences for the party.

MSZMP General Secretary K. Grosz expressed himself in the same spirit at the conference in Nograd Megye. In his opinion, the time has come to focus attention on the mistakes being made now, instead of on the mistakes of the past. He warned: While saying that the party must be accountable to society, certain political opponents of the MSZMP are, in fact, thinking about how to settle accounts with communists.

The Hungarian press widely cites MSZMP Presidium Member I. Pozsgay, who told Italian television that he will stay in the MSZMP only if the reformers win at the congress and the party is renewed on new organizational principles.

The MSZMP Central Committee plenum just held recommended that the congress discuss a party program statement submitted in draft form by I. Pozsgay. A draft congress resolution on national reconciliation was also approved. The topicality of this resolution lies in the fact that the congress will be held on the threshold of the 33d anniversary of the events of October 1956, which certain forces in the country would like to use to further destabilize the political situation.

Pre-Congress 'Struggle' in Party

PM0210145989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[S. Ivanov report: "Division or Unity. On the Eve of the MSZMP Congress"]

[Text] Everything indicates that the recent Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Central Committee plenum was the last intraparty event before the congress, which will open 6 October. This congress will evidently be a milestone for Hungary. It is hard as yet to predict the outcome of the congress since the political situation in the country, within the party itself, is by no means unequivocal, a TASS correspondent in Budapest told SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

Under the effect of the processes of radical democratization, the multiparty system and pluralism of opinions have become universally recognized facts, not only in society but also within the party itself. The occasionally inconsistent and even contradictory statements made by representatives of the top party echelon have added to the political picture within the country and, of course, within the MSZMP. It is no secret here that this triggered off a loss of confidence in the party and the reappraisal of a great deal that was done until very recently. The need to clear up loose ends also prompted the decision to convene the MSZMP congress ahead of schedule, next week.

The party conferences held in both Budapest and a number of other areas of the country were most interesting from the viewpoint of the preparations for the congress. Their participants focused their attention on the draft MSZMP program statement, the new draft rules, and a document entitled "Lessons of Hungary's Historical Development."

They aroused trenchant political debate at the MSZMP's Budapest conference. Speakers pointed out that the Hungarian capital's communists advocate MSZMP unity founded on radical reform and on consistent analysis and correction of past conduct. Most of the participants favored retaining its present title, but there were also proposals to call the party the "Hungarian Socialist Party." A host of proposals were voiced at the conference regarding the renewal of the party's work. Thus, in particular, it was proposed that the party congress should convene annually and that party organizations should be able to dispose of their own economic property independently. The conference participants rejected a proposal for those involved in the upcoming congress to discuss disbanding the MSZMP and creating a new party at the opening of the congress.

The struggle of opinions over the party's name, its presence in labor collectives, the transfer of the "center of gravity" to places of residence, and the forms and methods of its leading organs' work was also manifest at the party conferences in Pest, Nograd, and Borsod megyes at this time. The need to discuss the document "Lessons of Hungary's Historical Development" was debated at Megye conferences as well as at the Budapest forum. Many speakers proposed to stop "stirring up" the past since, in their opinion, this can only intensify mistrust of the MSZMP. The participants in the conferences elected incumbent party leaders as congress delegates.

To counterbalance these forums, as it were, the intraparty movement "Unity for the Renewal of the MSZMP" held its all-Hungarian conference on Sunday. It said outright that in the current situation the party is under a real threat of division. The speeches pointed out that the movement's members do not agree with reformists that the state should "move out of the economy." They believe that "selling the country's property" in the context of the reform is the beginning of a disastrous process.

In short, the closer the congress comes, the starker the polarity of opinions becomes and the louder the voices regarding the need for a radical transformation of the party grow. What will the MSZMP be like? Will it exist at all or will another party—or maybe even other parties—emerge? These questions worry all of Hungarian society today.

Dispute Over Slovenian Constitution Viewed

PM0410133989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch under the rubric "Following Up Event": "Presidency Issues Another Warning"]

[Text] Belgrade—TANJUG reports: session of the SFRY Presidency has been held in Belgrade to discuss the situation in the country following the adoption of amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia. Yugoslavia's supreme state organ reaffirmed that, as a result of the amendments and additions, certain articles of the Slovenian Constitution are at variance with the SFRY Constitution.

In connection with public concern about the future of the country and its constitutional order, the Presidency reaffirmed that the SFRY Constitution applies throughout Yugoslavia's territory, that it is necessary to respect the state's integrity, independence, and legal constitutional order, and that problems arising within the federation must be resolved within the framework of its Constitution.

According to the opinion of members of the Presidency, the difficulties of the prevailing situation can be overcome with the help of the Yugoslav Constitutional Court, which, as reported earlier in IZVESTIYA (No 274), at the request of the SFRY Assembly Federal Chamber is to decide the lawfulness or otherwise of the decision adopted by the Slovenian Assembly. It has been pointed out that the Constitutional Court must proceed from the fact that a republican constitution cannot be at variance with the Federal Constitution. Only on this basis can the problems which have arisen be resolved constructively.

In connection with the numerous letters, cables, and resolutions from rallies and meetings arriving in Belgrade from all parts of the country and expressing concern for Yugoslavia's unity and integrity and the normal functioning of federal organs after the changes to the Slovenian Constitution, the Presidency has issued a clear response: All federal organs are at present ensuring the normal functioning of all the country's constitutional and political systems, and there is no cause for citizens' protests and public demonstrations.

Meanwhile, a lively debate is under way in the local press on the submission of the controversial Slovenian amendments for consideration by the Yugoslav Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Court will probably not find it difficult to confirm that the Slovenian amendments are incompatible with the articles of the SFRY Constitution, POLITIKA EKSPRES writes. After this, the deputies of the Yugoslav Federal Assembly will not take long to reach the conclusion that the "constitutional campaign" in Slovenia seriously threatens the integrity and sovereignty of the federation as a federal state. And then? The deputies of the Slovenian Assembly will be cautioned...

and that is all! The problem is that the SFRY Constitution adopted in 1974 lacks a mechanism to protect the interests of the federation against violations of its constitution by individual members and prevent the sovereignty and other interests of an individual republic from being given priority over federal laws. "How did this 'hole in the ozone layer' of our constitution come about?"—the newspaper asks. "After all, it was perfectly possible to foresee during the discussion of the draft constitution, on which a whole army of politicians and experts worked, that this kind of situation might arise..."

Slovenia is now mounting an "all-around defense." No one has any intention of giving up the amendments to the republic constitution adopted by the republic Assembly. Neither the deputies, nor the public. Here is the firm stance of the League of Communists of Slovenia Central Committee as expressed recently at a rally by Milan Kucan, president of the League of Communists of Slovenia Central Committee Presidium: "The adoption of amendments to the Slovenian Constitution is a great cause of the sovereign Slovenian people and of all the other citizens of our republic. By adopting these amendments Slovenia has confirmed its constitutional rights within the SFRY as a democratic and voluntary association of equal, free, and sovereign peoples." In Kucan's opinion, time and future developments will tell whether this was done in Slovenia's own narrow interests or in the interests of all the peoples and ethnic groups of the federation and their socialist republics. Slovenia is not opposing other republics, it is not threatening anyone, still less the SFRY's stability and integrity. The amendments which have been adopted were not conceived by enemies, or anticommunists, or counterrevolutionaries, or separatists, Kucan went on. They, as Assembly deputies stated unanimously, express the will of the Slovenian working people, the will of the Slovenian nation. They were conceived by Communists who are true to their communist convictions and who have always devoted all their efforts to serving the people.

West Europe

Falin, FRG's Bahr Preside Over Working Groups

LD0410052389 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Bonn October 3 TASS—Common European problems were discussed by a joint working group of the SDPG [Social Democratic Party of Germany] group in the Bundestag and of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

They told a news conference here today the decision to instruct a working group to discuss these questions was made by Hans-Jochen Vogel, president of the SDPG, and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, during their meeting in Moscow last April.

The participants in the joint working group concentrated their attention on problems of building a common European home. It was decided to continue the discussion of all these problems in the spring of next year in Moscow.

Meanwhile experts from both parties will analyse in depth separate themes connected with evolving unified legal norms in Europe, as well as with environmental protection, energy policy, conversion of war industry facilities to peaceful uses and economic cooperation.

Falin Discusses GDR Refugees During Bonn Visit

LD0310154589 Hamburg DPA in German 1452 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The top Soviet politician Valentin Falin clearly reckons with another conjoint solution for the GDR refugees in the Federal German embassies in Prague and Warsaw. It is obvious, he said on Tuesday at a press conference with SPD [Social Democratic Party] politician Egon Bahr in Bonn. With reference to the emigration of thousands of refugees on special trains last weekend he added: "If precedences play a role, then we expect that this situation will also be solved."

In the words of Falin, who is the head of the International Department in the Central Committee of the CPSU, the visit by state and party head Mikhail Gorbachev to East Berlin will also take place "in a more easy atmosphere" following a settlement of the refugee problem. In his words the most recent development shows that relations between the Federal Republic and the GDR are not yet normalized enough to foresee such situations.

In the view of Falin, who was the ambassador of his country in Bonn for many years, the GDR is facing reforms. If the pace of expectations remains slower than the pace of development then changes will have to take place [as received]. A dynamic society needs renewals. If this does not happen then there will be difficulties.

Falin is in Bonn for discussions between the joint working group of the SPD and the CPSU.

FRG Warships To Visit Leningrad Mid-October

PM0310105589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Contacts Developing"]

[Text] Bonn, 27 Sep—Willi Bimmer, parliamentary state secretary at the FRG Ministry of Defense, pointed out at a meeting with journalists the favorable prospects for developing relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union in all spheres, including the military sphere. He briefed them on an accord on the exchange of visits by warships.

A detachment of FRG naval ships comprising the frigate "Niedersachsen," the destroyer "Rommel," and the storeship "Coburg" will visit Leningrad in mid-October.

Zagladin in France on 'Delays' in Perestroyka

LD0210102389 Paris Domestic Service in French 0700 GMT 2 Oct 89

[Text] Perestroyka, directions for use: 335 Soviet envoys arrived in Paris yesterday morning to explain the reforms underway in their country. There are artists, economists, members of nationalist movements. A delegation will be received by President Mitterand this afternoon. It will be led by Vadim Zagladin, one of Mikhail Gorbachev's advisers. Before leaving Moscow Mr Zagladin explained to Ulysse Gosset [Paris radio correspondent] that perestroyka is operating badly because of the blockages at the summit of the state—the revolution at the top overtaken by the revolution at the bottom.

[Begin recording] [Zagladin] There are delays originating at the top, delays in the work of the Supreme Soviet, which works very well, but rather at length. It is not fast enough. There are many laws which have to be adopted in order to make progress with reform, and it was said at the Central Committee [plenum] and even before, that the party itself is falling behind the processes which are developing in the country, so there are delays which need to be eliminated.

[Gosset] Is there not a risk of the revolution from below overtaking that of above?

[Zagladin] That could happen, and we must do everything possible to make sure that it does not happen. You know, one of our errors at the beginning was perhaps that we did not say specifically and openly that perestroyka does not mean 1 month or 1 year, or even 2 years, that it is quite a long process which will involve enormous difficulties. [end recording]

Finn Cited on Balts' Need To Remember Nazi Aims

PM0410092989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "KANSAN UUTISET on the Situation in Estonia"]

[Text] Helsinki, 2 Oct—"Hitler's atrocities have been forgotten in the Baltic region"—under this headline the newspaper KANSAN UUTISET has published a letter from a reader, Tayto Tiikhonen. In it the author writes: It seems to me that in Estonia people are idealizing the rightwing dictatorship which ruled the republic before World War II. People regard that regime totally uncritically and even pine for it.

Is this due to nostalgia for capitalism, or are some people succumbing to their illusions about it? Or is this happening because antisocialist feelings are quite pronounced in the Estonian movement? One feels that people here are ready to adopt everything capitalist, complete with all its negative phenomena.

It is also clearly visible that antisocialist manifestations are taking place against a background of anti-Soviet and anti-Russian actions. After all, certain circles in Estonia have gone so far as to honor the memory of peoples who fought on the Hitlerites' side against the Soviet Army and at the same time are demanding the destruction of monuments to Soviet soldiers.

I am also struck by the fact that neither in Estonia nor in the other Baltic republics do people condemn the atrocities of Hitler's hordes on these lands when talking about the war times. Can the Estonians and other Balts really have forgotten that, had the Soviet soldiers not driven the Hitlerites out of the Baltic region, hardly anything would have remained of those peoples except memories if Nazi racial theory had been put into practice.

The growth of anti-Russian and anti-Soviet feelings makes one wonder what intrigues are still being woven behind the scenes.

Finnish Communist Cited on Estonian Nationalism

PM0310103589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Finnish Communist on Situation in Estonia"]

[Text] Helsinki, 29 Sep—"Estonia and Us" is the title of an article published in the Vaasa City newspaper TYOVAEN POHJANMAA. Its author, the Finnish Communist Sten Soderstrom, writes: "It is a time for erecting monuments in Estonia. In Pyarnu, our twinned city, a memorial plaque has been installed to former Estonian President K. Pyatsu. Neither the Estonian nor the Finnish bourgeois press has said a word here about how he was a great friend of the fascists and Nazi Germany and that he ruled in the late thirties by what were almost dictatorial methods.

"Last week, HELSINGIN SANOMAT reported, a monument to 'the fighters for a free Estonia' was unveiled in the northern part of Estonia, near Rakvere. In actual fact it is a monument to the Estonian SS.

"USSR People's Deputy Tiit Made publishes openly racist items in the Swedish press about the Russians' barbarism and their inferiority to the Estonians.

"These three examples attest to the situation which prevails in some Estonian circles. Everything Estonian is approved a priori however conservative or even fascist its spirit may be. Certain circles have gone so far as to call the international movement organization created in Estonia 'hostile.' The situation has become so acute that some Finnish tourist groups, despite their requests, are not having meetings organized for them with representatives of the international movement. Surely you do not want to talk with enemies was the comment!

"National fanaticism attests yet again to the destructive influence it can have. It can lead to nothing but the emergence of new problems and endless disputes.

"As a Finnish Communist I am struck by the situation which has taken shape. Where is the Soviet peoples' friendship and mutual understanding? This path is the path to destruction. It can lead only to suffering and despair."

Lukyanov, Finland's Sorsa Discuss Cooperation

LD0410035189 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—In a friendly conversation here today Soviet First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov and speaker of the Finnish legislature Kalevi Sorsa discussed the deepening of good-neighbourly cooperation between the USSR and Finland in the light of Mikhail Gorbachev's planned official visit to that country.

The two officials also examined ways to develop inter-parliamentary ties in the interests of stronger peace and mutual understanding between the peoples.

Sorsa arrived in Moscow to attend the opening of the first joint Soviet-Finnish venture in the USSR, the Savoy hotel in Moscow.

Lukyanov Receives Danish Ambassador's Credentials

PM0310144789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Credentials Presented"]

[Text] V. Egebjerg, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Denmark, presented his credentials to A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, in the Kremlin 28 September.

In recent years, the ambassador pointed out, we have witnessed the positive development of East-West relations. A number of specific steps have been taken with the aim of building a calmer and safer world. And it is particularly important to maintain momentum under these conditions. Good Soviet-Danish relations, which are of great significance in themselves, at the same time also contribute to international development as a whole.

Accepting the credentials on behalf of the Presidium and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, A.I. Lukyanov emphasized that the Soviet Union and Denmark take an active part in the dialogue on great and complex problems of European security. As the organizers of the second and third stages of the CSCE conference on the human dimension, our two countries are called upon to promote the adoption of major decisions which will assert qualitatively new parameters of European contacts in this sphere, too. The deepening of cooperation among the countries of the north European region, in which positive experience of interaction has been accumulated within the framework of the all-European process, is of great significance.

After the presentation of credentials and an exchange of speeches between A.I. Lukyanov and V. Egebjerg thorough talks were held, during which both sides advocated the continuation of the Soviet-Danish political dialogue on all levels, the development of trade and economic relations, and the further strengthening of contacts in various spheres.

Participating in the talks were I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and E.L. Kuzmin, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat International Relations Department.

Brutents Leaves for UK Labour Party Forum

PM0410091189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At Laborites' Invitation"]

[Text] K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, left for London 30 September to take part in the annual conference of the Labour Party of Great Britain at the invitation of its national executive committee.

Latin America & Caribbean

Shevardnadze Arrives in Managua for Working Visit

Met at Airport by Ortega

LD0310232789 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Managua October 3 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze arrived in Nicaragua on a working visit today.

At the Managua International Airport, the minister was welcomed by Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega and members of the national leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front and the government.

Present at the airport was also V. Nikolayenko, Soviet ambassador to Nicaragua.

Makes Statement Upon Arrival

LD0410091489 Moscow TASS in English 0844 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] Managua October 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze arrived in Nicaragua on Tuesday [3 October] for a working visit at the invitation of the country's leadership.

At Managua International Airport he was met by Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega, Foreign Minister

Miguel d'Escoto, and by members of the National Leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (SNLF) and the government.

Among the welcoming party was Valeriy Nikolayenko, Soviet ambassador to Nicaragua.

Welcoming Shevardnadze to Nicaragua, Ortega voiced confidence that the forthcoming Soviet-Nicaraguan talks would contribute to the Soviet Union's peace efforts in the international arena and to Nicaragua's work for peace in Central America.

In reply Shevardnadze thanked Ortega for his welcome.

"I am profoundly grateful for the opportunity to visit your legendary country and to meet your heroic people, the president and members of the National Leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front," Shevardnadze said.

He conveyed words of greeting and good wishes to all Nicaraguan people and to President Daniel Ortega from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"We attach much importance to our talks," Shevardnadze said, "because they will be held at a very crucial stage when, due to new prospects, your revolution is entering a period of peaceful development. We cordially welcome and support this."

"The Soviet Union would like to make its contribution to this historic cause," he emphasised.

Shevardnadze laid a wreath at the mausoleum of Carlos Fonseca, the founder of the SNLF.

Before the talks with Ortega, Shevardnadze made an unscheduled stop in Revolution Plaza where he spoke to residents of Managua. The Soviet guest took interest in the life of Nicaraguan people.

He conveyed warm greetings from Soviet people and voiced confidence that peace would thrive in Nicaragua.

"Soviet people know well what war is," he said, "and support the Nicaraguans' striving for lasting peace in the country".

Talks between Shevardnadze and Ortega began later in the day. Taking part in the talks were Vice President Sergio Ramirez, Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto, Humberto Ortega and Henry Ruiz, members of the Sandinista National Leadership. The talks are being held in a cordial and comradely atmosphere.

Commentary Examines Nicaragua's 'Flexible' Policy

LD0410022389 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, is visiting Nicaragua, the first visit by such a high-ranking Soviet official to that Central American country. But the importance of the visit is not confined to that fact alone, writes our commentator Mikhail Mayorov.

The current Soviet-Nicaraguan dialogue comes at a time of a drastic turn in the situation in Central America. This hotspot is cooling down, and that is happening first of all thanks to the flexible policy pursued by the Sandinist leadership of Nicaragua, augmented by efforts by Moscow. The Sandinists have been thwarting the forecasts of American politicians who claim that Managua will never stage free, democratic elections. The agreements signed in August by the leaders of Central American states and the Nicaraguan Government have been scrupulously carried out. Next February should see a veritable (?war) at the polling stations in that country, considering the tension of the current political debates in the country in which most diverse opposition forces are openly taking part. But these battles will mean already a long awaited return in Nicaragua to a peaceful life.

The Soviet Union has never actually had to choose between peace and war in Nicaragua throughout the past 8 years. Moscow has always supported all the efforts that might lead to a stop to the fratricidal war and has been making its own efforts to gain this. The newsmen who gathered a few days ago at the Foreign Ministry press center in Moscow were told that after 1988 no Soviet arms were supplied to Nicaragua any longer. The aim of that move is the same: to help reach a truce in the region.

And so the normalization of the situation in Central America has been promoted by what is known as new political thinking. People who have tried lately to cast doubts on the relations between the USSR and Nicaragua have apparently failed to take this point into account. The two countries are linked now by more than a simple trade exchange, so one can boldly speak now about a common approach to a settlement in the region without any secret diplomacy or evil intent to a third country. This is political cooperation in the interests of tranquillity and stability in Central America. This cooperation could have been more effective and fruitful if from bilateral it had turned into multilateral. Let this sound as a clear hint to that third country on whose policies so much depends in the state of affairs in the region.

Attempt To Topple Panama's Noriega Fails 3 Oct

TASS Reports Military Uprising

LD0310212789 Moscow TASS in English 2110 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Panama City October 3 TASS—By TASS correspondents Eldar Abdullayev and Alexander Chernov:

A group of middle-ranking officers of Panama's Defence Forces on Tuesday announced on national radio that they had toppled Defence Forces' Chief General Manual Antonio Noriega.

Their communique, signed by the commanders of several Army and police units, said the whereabouts of the Defence Forces' General Staff, led by Noriega, were unknown.

The rebel officers confirmed the Army's loyalty to Panama's interim government and support for the Organisation of American States' decision on early general elections in the country.

The communique denied involvement of other countries and civil organisations in the developments, saying that this action was an internal affair of the military, taken "within the framework of the process started by General Torrijos to put an end to corruption and reorganise society."

The rebel officers took over the military headquarters and warned they would open fire at anyone who tries to enter the headquarters barracks.

The announcement followed shootouts which began early in the morning near the barracks. The Defence Forces' riot-control units blocked approaches to the Presidential Palace, barracks and other major facilities.

The U.S. Southern Command put U.S. troops in the Panama Canal Zone on high alert. The American personnel received weapons and munitions and were forbidden any travel. U.S. military planes and helicopters were seen flying over the city.

Classes in the Canal Zone were interrupted. Traffic on the Americas Bridge was stopped.

The Southern Command said there was no immediate threat to U.S. nationals or facilities so far.

Telephone communications and power supply in the city were cut.

Reports on the developments in Panama are confusing. Presidential Palace spokesmen and representatives of the leadership of the ruling Revolutionary Democratic Party and the People's Party told TASS that the Defence Forces kept control of the city's downtown areas and that the situation in the Defence Forces' units remained stable.

At the same time, they could not say definitely what had really happened and what had caused the disorders.

Washington October 3 TASS—The UPI News Agency quoted unidentified Panamanian officials as saying that anti-government forces had tried to seize General Noriega and take him to the United States.

The AP News Agency said helicopters of the U.S. Southern Command were seen in the shooting area, observing the action.

A Pentagon spokesman said that, according to reports from the Southern Command, "a disturbance of some nature is apparently under way" at the Defence Forces' headquarters. He confirmed that all 12,000 U.S. troops stationed in Panama had been put on high alert.

Reports of U.S. Support Cited

LD0310221489 Moscow TASS in English 2111 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Panama City October 3 TASS—Lieutenant-Colonel Arnulfo Castrejon of the Defence Forces' General Staff said on national television on Tuesday that the Navy, Infantry Battalion 2000 and other units remained loyal to the Defence Forces' Chief General Manuel Antonio Noriega.

Castrejon said the group of middle-ranking officers, who earlier in the day had announced they had toppled Noriega, was "small" and supported by the United States.

The EFE news agency quoted Castrejon as saying that Battalion 2000 had surrounded the headquarters barracks, taken over by the rebel officers.

Panama TV Reports Rebels' Surrender

LD0310221789 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Panama City October 4 TASS—By TASS correspondents Eldar Abdullayev and Aleksandr Chernov:

A group of officers, who attempted to topple General Manuel Antonio Noriega on Tuesday morning, has given up resistance and surrendered to the Defence Forces' units loyal to the military leadership, national television has reported.

The report said that Noriega and other members of the defence forces' command were safe and that Noriega personally directed the operation to seize military headquarters barracks, taken over by the rebels.

The television announcement said the insurrection was confined only to the capital and did not spread to the country's military institutions.

The overwhelming majority of the defence forces' personnel expressed their support for Noriega and the provisional government, the report said.

The broadcast quoted the commanders of several units in the provinces as condemning the rebels' actions.

The announcement followed intensive shootouts in the barracks' area, wrapped in smoke.

Soldiers surrounded the headquarters, keeping reporters away.

Panama's Interior Ministry warned local journalists that national television and radio are the only reliable source of information on developments in the country and that journalists distributing unconfirmed or "deliberately distorted news" would be prosecuted.

Noriega, in Control, Appears on TV

LD0410084789 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] Panama City October 4 TASS—In a brief television appearance after abortive coup attempt General Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of the Panamanian National Defence Force (NDF), said that the situation in the country was under control and that the central barracks had been cleared of rebels.

The military authorities have imposed a curfew in Panama.

Noriega also said that army units in other Panamanian districts had confirmed their loyalty to the provisional government and the military leadership.

The general refused to name officers who had taken part in the revolt, which, according to him, had been encouraged by the United States. He emphasised that an investigation was currently under way, the results of which would be announced later.

General Noriega said the United States Army South Command (USARCO) troops deployed in Panama had blocked the Pan-American highway and other strategic roads for several hours.

USARCO continues flights over the Panamanian capital.

The National Defence Force units are concentrated in the centre of Panama city. The rebels are being kept in different parts of the capital under the guard of army units loyal to the authorities. About a hundred disarmed servicemen are reportedly under guard in the capital's Amador stadium.

Supreme Soviet Session

Akhromeyev Addresses Supreme Soviet on Amnesty

LD0310202889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1755 GMT 2 Oct 89

[Speech by Sergey Akhromeyev, deputy from Constituency No 697, Moldavia, at the 2 October proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Akhromeyev, constituency No 697, Moldavia. Esteemed comrade deputies: After the 9 years and 2 months of combat operations in Afghanistan, 312 servicemen from the 40th Army are missing. Some of these servicemen died, but a considerable percentage of them are prisoners of enemy detachments or are overseas. It has to be said that the overwhelming majority of these people conducted themselves correctly and were taken prisoner, as one might be overtaken by calamity. They were taken prisoner—I have worked on this matter in my time as a specific duty—either while conducting combat operations at night or during operations in enemy rear areas as part of an individual group, or during actions to defend and hold communications posts, where people had to operate in very small subunits. A certain number of them were taken through their own carelessness or indiscipline.

In all, if you reckon that approximately 520,000 people experienced combat operations in Afghanistan, this is 0.06 percent of the total number who fought there during the 9 years and more. However, each of these people is one of our Soviet people. Each has the same homeland, and as far as the homeland is concerned, each of our people is unique and and cannot be replaced, and we are obliged to be concerned about each one. This is especially true because some of these people conducted themselves heroically when taken prisoner. For example, we know of a case in 1986 on Pakistani territory in which nine servicemen who had been taken prisoner rose up, seized weapons and a fortress [krepost]—over there a fortress is a major structure surrounded by a strong brick wall—and for 2 days waged an armed struggle. They fought and inflicted great losses on the enemy. When the enemy burst into this fortress they blew it up and everyone died.

So the overwhelming majority of these people are our people, and in itself being taken prisoner is not a military crime. Among these 312 we are talking about now we have information about approximately 8-10 people which says that they went over to the enemy, and among them are some who fought against us, who took part in killings and torture. There would be virtually nothing to say about the vast majority of them, if they were not overseas and if each of them could not learn about our decisions concerning their fate and have the right to choose freely to return home or not.

So what is to become of those 8 or 10? Of course, it would be all the same to each of them were he to come here and not be given a pardon, amnesty, before an investigation was conducted, prior to making a decision. However, if he doesn't get it, if we do not make such a decision, that's what I'm saying, and if there is such a decision, that means there would be a pardon. I didn't put it very clearly. However, what are we to do about these people? I also think that apart from those people who took part in killings and torture, there should be pardon, it should stand; but we cannot give a pardon to criminals, who tortured our people, our servicemen, or took part in the killing of them. That is my opinion.

Now, the second thing, the large group who, well, it also happens that over that period we had several hundred people prosecuted for military crimes they committed, who were arrested over there and brought to USSR territory. A certain proportion of them has been released, and some are still, well, under guard. What is to become of them? Obviously we cannot—as the comrades said correctly—have one approach to those who are overseas and another to those who are in our country. Obviously there have to be common criteria; there can be no pardon for those who took part in killings and torture and there should be a single approach to all the rest, whether they are abroad or in the USSR. I support the view expressed by Comrade Golyakov. The issue is not that simple and even were we to issue, promulgate, release a Supreme Soviet decision, all the same it would need to be explained to the Soviet people; they would demand explanations of why we acted in that way. Therefore, the decision, or what follows the decision, should be preceeded by serious information from the Supreme Soviet giving the motivation for this decision. Thank you for your attention.

Comparison of Sukharev Remarks on Amnesty

LD0310213889

Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1645 GMT on 2 October, in its recorded relay of the 2 October Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin, carries a 10-minute recorded version of remarks by USSR Procurator General Sukharev discussing amnesty for former servicemen of the Soviet troops in Afganistan. Comparison of the Moscow Television item with the translation of the Moscow Domestic Russian version, which appeared on pages 55-57 of the 3 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the title 'Sukharev Cited on Amnesty for Troops' reveals the following variations:

Beginning with column one, paragraph four, first sentence on page 56, Moscow TV reports an additional two paragraphs: "[Begin Sukharev recording] Esteemed comrade deputies, presented for your examination is one of the important questions, engendered by the presence and participation of the soviet military units in combat operations on the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan. The consequences of this presence are universally known. For a long time to come they will still make themselves felt.

"One of the most acute and painful problems is the fate of our young fellow countrymen who found themselves prisoner of the Afghan armed opposition. There are more than 300 of them. The circumstances of the disappearance and whereabouts of each one of them have not, unfortunately, been fully established to date, although our government and the competent state bodies are taking the essential measures. According to defense Ministry data about one-third of them have apparently died in battles. As far as about 70 people are concerned there is data about their detention in various armed formations of the Afghan opposition on the territory of Afghanistan and Pakistan. A number of the former Soviet servicemen have surfaced in the United States, Canada and some other Western countries. The fate of the remaining ones who have disappeared without a trace is being looked into. It is understandable that the fate of these people cannot leave anyone indifferent. Not only the relatives and their near and dear, but also the general Soviet public feel keenly for them and their fate. Various comittees have been set up in our country and abroad to facilitate their return to the homeland. We all recall how trenchantly this issue was raised at the Congress of People's Deputies and at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"The problem has..."

Ryzhkov's Speech to Supreme Soviet 2 Oct

PM0310173189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2-4

[Report delivered by Soviet Premier Ryzhkov at the 2 October Supreme Soviet session, entitled "New Legislative Basis for the Strategy of Deepening the Economic Reform. Report by N.I. Ryzhkov at the Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies: In accordance with what was decided during the first congress of people's deputies, the USSR Council of Ministers has put forward for the Supreme Soviet's examination a package of fundamental legislative acts which are to open up a new stage in the development of the economic reform and to create the foundation for a radical transformation in relations in the sphere of production.

Before I dwell on the most important provisions of the laws about to be presented, it would, apparently, be in order to say a few words about what the government proceeded from during their elaboration. Over the past few years society has taken an enormous step along the path of democratization and has traversed what is truly a far-reaching path of overcoming the stereotypes and dogmas that had taken shape over the decades, determining the economic foundation of socialism.

The nature of the highest bodies of state authorities in the country has altered radically. The restructuring processes, begun at the party's initiative, have roused political activeness among millions of people and engendered hopes for a turn for the better in tackling the most pressing and worrying problems. Experience of the past years of perestroyka is invaluable, above all because of the great variety and novelty of complex tasks that had to be tackled in the course of the economic reform both within theoretical and practical terms of reference. It is precisely this experience that has formed new views—not merely in the sphere of social sciences, but at all levels of national economic management.

In this situation we perceive anew the entire depth of Lenin's words to the effect that politics is a concentrated expression of the economy. The contradictions between the higher expectations of the masses and the results of economic development at present make a serious imprint on the very course of the economic and political reforms in the country. For the time being, the people do not see any substantial results of perestroyka in the area of most direct concern to them—enhancing the standard of life.

In a situation such as this, one can hear voices: Would it not be better to return to the old, administrative and command methods? I think that no matter how great the difficulties we come up against during the implementation of the economic reform, one must not diverge from this path. Society will simply not accept a return to the old days—all the more so, because, in their essence, these methods are blind alley methods and they will not get the country out of the complicated situation in which it finds itself—neither at present, nor in the future.

The preconditions for dynamic growth of the national economy and for resolving the pressing social problems can be created only on the basis of an in-depth and consistent transformation of the production relations. If the draft plan and the draft budget for the next year that have been presented and the serious measures to make the economy healthier, provided for therein, represent, as it were, the tactic of stabilization, then the documents whose examination is being commenced by the USSR Supreme Soviet today represent a major step in the implementation of the strategy of socioeconomic transformations drawn up by the First Congress of People's Deputies.

One of the most important questions, to which an exhaustive and precise answer must be given is this: Are the measures that are being proposed sufficiently radical? Is it impossible to move considerably further in formulating the legal bases of a socialist market economy today? Without anticipating the outcome of the debate, I'll put my point of view on that matter. Perhaps I, and some of the deputies, would like the measures which are being proposed to be as radical as possible, even now. However, we have to be realists: General wishes and abstract, at times hypothetical, concepts are one thing; specific laws, i.e. documents regulating the practical course of the economic life of an immense country, are another. These must be strictly in line not only with the economic situation of tomorrow, but also with that of today, the reality of which is, unfortunately, one of finances in deep disorder, a powerful monopoly structure, and a disorganized market.

In the course of the reform we have already repeatedly come up against the negative consequences of decisions made without taking into account the actual economic situation, the immense inertia of the forms of organizing economic life which had developed, and the readiness of society to accept these decisions during the process of drawing them up.

Let us recall the Law on Cooperatives: It is now clear that when this was being drawn up the kind of specific economic environment in which it would operate was not fully taken into account. In this connection we are having to correct it. The relevant work, as you know, is already under way in the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet. Moreover, the logic and pace of perestroyka are such that, despite the progressive nature of many decisions adopted in the course of economic reform, they have already started to become obsolete and to hold back many processes intended to ensure that the changes in the economy go deeper. Therefore, every step forward now to further improve economic legislation must be checked particularly precisely. I hope that the Supreme Soviet will support this approach.

I would particularly like to dwell on the fundamental principles of formulating the new bills. First, they must be on the basis of the theoretical developments made in the course of the economic reform and also of an in-depth analysis of the experience which has been accumulated, they must cultivate and incorporate all the best things and take into account any reasonable proposal from the republics, the local governing bodies, and the general public.

Second, in accordance with the recommendations of the Congress of people's Deputies, the draft should include as much specific detail as does not impinge on the rights of the union republics and as will enable these documents to be submitted as the bases of the legislation on ownership, land, leasing, the enterprise, and taxation.

Third, they should incorporate the idea of creating equal legal, economic, and social conditions and the opportunity for development of diverse forms of ownership and economic management.

Fourth, they should take into account the condition of society at the given stage of development and its readiness to put into practice those legal norms and provisions which alter radically the very notion of the ways and methods of building socialism and at the same time to not lead to a renunciation of socialism and its truly humane and democratic concept.

The draft laws that have been submitted certainly bear the stamp of the political situation which is inextricably connected with perestroyka. Precisely for this rason all of the fundamental provisions of the drafts stem organically from the CPSU platform on the party's nationalities policy in contemporary conditions adopted by the party Central Committee plenum. It has to be said that in society, interest has been constantly growing in these problems and in the preparation of the corresponding documents. A very serious conversation revolved around the new tasks, at the resolution of which they are aimed, both at the Congress of People's Deputies and at the previous session. All of the mass media bear witness to the fact that people's inertial attitude to these fundamental areas in the development of our socialist state, which was current only a few years ago, has now been literally exploded. Various points of view, at times directly opposing one another, and out-of-the ordinary proposals bear witness to the aspiration of scientists, specialists, the broad strata of the public and labor collectives to be involved in these key studies.

It is natural that on such complex matters there was no single opinion, and evidently, there could not be one. From this point of view I would like to say a few words on the alternative variants being proposed to the draft laws under discussion. In our view many of the proposals contained in them are useful and constructive. In the course of preparing the drafts the government made maximum use of them. The increase in attention in society to these problems convinces us how much is provided by the process of democratization for improving legislative work, making it possible to use accumulated knowledge, qualifications, and experience, but at the same time one has to bear in mind that behind each of the alternative variants lie definite interests. As a rule, they upset the fine balance of rights and responsibilities which actually determines equality of conditions of economic activity, social fairness, the possibility of the economy's steady development, and the guarantee in all of this of the supreme role of the individual.

But we have all already had an opportunity to convince ourselves how, by not heeding any arguments, the protection of the interests of some people can inflict a blow on others. Economic and political problems are currently intertwined in the most intimate manner. They are often inseparable from one another, but it is particularly important to take account of their interconnection where interethnic relations are at issue. It is precisely here that the policy of confrontation and attempts to achieve advantage for one nationality or a national-territorial formation at the expense of others, or at the expense of the interests of the whole union, lead to the gravest consequences. For this reason, in elaborating the provisions which regulate the mutual relations of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, it was essential to seek out to a maximum degree ways of coordinating contradictory positions, of achieving mutually acceptable compromises which do not undermine the foundations of our socialist federation and create the prerequisites both for securing the real sovereignty of the republics and for the effective fulfillment of their functions by the union organs. Economic reform has an inherent logic and stages of development.

We all want things to go faster, but only profoundly thought-out and comprehensively analyzed decisions that take into account the entire variety of the economic, social, and political factors that determine the country's development are capable of bringing about success. It is precisely this approach that was to be found at the basis of the documents that were elaborated and presented for your examination. The government hopes that a constructive and businesslike examination of these drafts at the current Supreme Soviet session, a comparison of various viewpoints and alternative options will, on the basis of a deep and all-round assessment, make it possible to pass laws that will become a reliable foundation for the country's further economic development.

I

Comrades, today no one is in any doubt about the fact that the success of the economic reform and thus of the entire perestroyka depends to a decisive extent on what directions the transformation of ownership will take. The structure of ownership should in its profound basis accord with the ideals and values of humane and democratic socialism. In drawing up the draft law on property we have proceeded from the fact that today's problems and contradictions cannot cancel out two fundamental factors. First, the existence in our country of socialist public ownership, which is expressed in the working people's—hence society's and the people's—possession of the basic means of production. This form of ownership is without exaggeration one of mankind's achievements. Its essence is such that it should create wide opportunities for the working man and guarantee him his due place in society. The second fundamental factor is that private ownership of the means of production, founded upon the exploitation of man, has been surmounted, and personal property based upon labor has been formed.

The great potential inherent in the structure of ownership, regrettably, was not fated to be fully revealed in our society. The entire structure of ownership was nationalized across the board; the sphere of utilization of cooperative property was sharply reduced owing to the artificial curtailment of the activities of most types of cooperatives, and what amounted to nationalization of kolkhozes and consumer cooperatives. Private-sector labor activity in agriculture, cottage industries, and trading and consumer services was halted. All-people's ownership itself turned into intensely centralized, bureaucratically organized state ownership. These processes have continued right up until very recently.

If in 1970 the proportion of state ownership within the fixed capital of the national economy amounted to 83 percent, then by the year 1988 it grew to 88 percent. Over the same years the proportion of the citizens' private ownership went down from 8.6 percent to 3.4 percent. Literally everything within the national economy became state property, from the land and the gigantic hydroelectric power stations to small consumer services workshops. It was, essentially, this that engendered the formation of the now sharply criticized system of the management of the national economy, the fusion of the state ownership with the other attributes of the administrative system, the strictly vertical management of all the economic property, the economic activities being shackled by the innumerable strict regulations and instructions.

As an inevitable consequence, the most terrible thing was born—the isolation, the alienation of ownership from the man of labor. And after all, the only way of creating an interest in highly productive and effective labor is through the interest arising from ownership. Attempts were made to cover up the antagonism arising between man and state ownership, perceived by the people as a kind of abstraction and dissappearing economic category by various kinds of idelogical capers and scientific substantions. We are reaping the fruits of all that now. As the people say, life teaches you. The imbalance of finances, the paucity of the consumer market, supermonopoly in the national economy, parasitism of plunderers and corrupting elements—that is also the logical consequence of ownership coming within the state's remit without any bounds.

In drawing up new legislation the government took as its point of departure that enterprises' and citizens' economic interest in efficient management can be enhanced only on the basis of "denationalization" of the economy and the formation of a genuine multiplicity of structures. For the time being, about 90 percent of the main means of production with be in the framework of one owner, the state. All talk of developing the market will remain without content and the practical movement of the country toward progress impossible. The draft law consolidates the multiplicity of forms of socialist ownership, public ownership, and also of ownership by the citizen which excludes man's exploitation of man. This is an important step toward creating the prerequisites for deepening economic reform. We proceed from the premise that public property is also the property of the state, the property of the cooperatives, public organizations, joint stock companies, and other economic partnerships, and their rational combination must be determined by efficiency in the conditions of a regulated socialist market and by their ability to meet social needs most rationally.

One of the most difficult issues, and one that is arousing much discussion at the present time—evidently the debate will continue in the Supreme Soviet—is the delimitation of a unified state ownership vested in the whole nation. The proposal is that four varieties of state property should be distinguished: all-Union property; Union-Republic property, that is, property of the Union and of the corresponding republic; republican, of the Union autonomous republics; property of the national-territorial and administrative-territorial formations; (communal property). This solution is determined by logic itself and by the federal nature of the USSR. It is closely connected with the forthcoming transfer of the Union republics and of particular regions of the country to financial autonomy and self-financing and creates the necessary legal basis for this.

A prediction of how the distribution of state property according to its varieties will proceed, and what processes common to the whole country will develop here, can be made on the basis of the experience of Belorussia's transition to regional financial autonomy. In that republic the proportion of industrial output relating to enterprises which are being transferred to republican ownership will be about half. At present only 7 percent of the industrial output is produced at enterprises under the authority of the republic. The proportion of the number of workers employed at enterprises in the sphere of material production which are under the republic's jurisdiction will be almost doubled and will comprise more than 60 percent. The republic will plan independently nearly two-thirds of its capital investments.

It is estimated that in the country as a whole, about 70 percent of the total assets of the national economy, including the predominant part of funds for nonproduction purposes, will be under the jurisdiction of the union republics.

As you can see, comrades, the national economies of the union republics are assuming, in effect, a new quality. It has not been easy to come to a decision on the problems of who ought to be the subject of ownership of the land, minerals, the forests, waterways and, naturally, the riches of the continental shelf. Keeping them as the exclusive property of the USSR did not meet with support in a number of union republics. Transferring all these possessions only into the hands of the union republics would in effect deprive the federation of the economic foundation for normal functioning and would make it harder to carry out tasks organically inherent in the single national economic complex.

In this case we took the road of recognizing union republican ownership, whereby the union retains the opportunity of creating common bases for the use of land and natural resources taking into account statewide and interrepublican requirements and the country's defense and security needs. At the same time, the union republics get the right to possess, utilize and dispose of the natural resources situated on their territory. I think we have succeeded in achieving a reasonable balance of interests. Of course, we understand that far from all the problems of relations between the republics and the union can be regulated in this way. Without doubt, the adoption of this kind of statute will require amending the USSR Constitution and the union republican constitutions, as well as elaborating supplementary acts of legislation regulating these relations.

Without dwelling in detail on other provisions of the bill concerning the transfer by the state of the competence of ownership—I refer to union and autonomous republics and other administrative-territorial formations—I would like to say, concerning all-union property, that this is of particular economic and political significance for our socialist federation. From the economic point of view, those types of production in which all union republics and regions of the country have an interest should indisputably come under state jurisdiction as all-union property. It is that framework which determines the stability of economic relations between regions, on the one hand, and guarantees the viability of the state, regardless of what situations develop, on the other. From the political point of view, all-union property has an integrating basis, promoting the creation of conditions for the harmonious development of all the country's nationalities and ethnic groups, the consolidation of the forces of society to strengthen the economic and political might of the state. All-union property can, of course, develop and function only in organic interaction with all other types of ownership. Hence it follows that we must consistently pursue the line of granting equal rights and opportunities for development of state ownership in all its forms and of ownership of cooperative and other public organizations, as well as citizens' property. Herein lie the specific roads to the emergence of a multistructured economy.

I would particularly like to stress that the transformation of ownership relations is not an aim in itself. It should ensure a substantial increase in the efficiency of production. Only on this basis is it possible to change the situation in the country decisively, to create a dynamic, flexible economy oriented toward solving social problems and to the needs of the Soviet person. At the same time, the state has no right to use the power it possesses in a sovereign manner for the creation of any kind of economic privileges for any particular type of ownership. All proprietors, regardless of the section in which they function, must have equal access to sources of necessary material and financial resources and to the marketing of the output they produce on domestic and foreign markets.

Under conditions where the economy has multiple layers it will not be possible to preserve the traditional structure of relations within the state sector.

State enterprises fettered by bureaucracy are not capable of competing with their flexible rivals. This is precisely why a fundamentally new provision concerning the rights of the state enterprise to property owned by the state has been formulated in the law on ownership. This means that the enterprise possesses, used, and disposes of this property within the limits restricted only by legislation. The state retains only those rights to manage the possessions of an enterprise that are established by the law on socialist enterprise. In this situation we are obliged to ensure the real autonomy of management by the work collective and a great deal here will depend on the position of the state proprietor and to what extent it has learned to display restraint, to renounce petty tutelage, and to start to respect the rights of a financially autonomous enterprise.

Great hopes are being pinned on the development of joint-stock forms of ownership for solving this problem, including as applied to the state enterprise.

We are entitled to assume that as market relations develop and a securities market comes into being, the process of enterprises being transformed into the form of state joint-stock companies will gather pace in our country. A law on joint-stock companies is being drawn up by the USSR Council of Ministers.

I would like to single out the main thing in the problem of distributing other types of property among the various subjects of state authority: The handing over to the union and autonomous republics, the oblasts and towns and cities of the right of ownership, should not lead to a violation of the rights of enterprises. If the command and administrative system administered from the center is replaced by numerous regional bureaucratic administrative structures, we will not succeed in resolving the problems facing the country. Enterprises should have the same rights, irrespective of under whose authority they are. For the general national market it does not matter on the territory of which union republic an enterprise is located and who its owners are. If this principle is not put into effect, then the single market will not materialize either.

One more issue on which lively discussion has developed—the attitude to private ownership. Certain comrades link the main hopes for the development of our economy and society with precisely this. But let us nevertheless remember that we are living at the end of the 20th, and not in the mid-19th century. Even in the developed capitalist countries, private ownership by individual citizens of the means of production has long ceased to serve as the main base of the economy. As a rule the owners are joint-stock companies, corporations which can only with great reservations be described as private ownership.

It is known that Marx linked the dismantling of traditional private ownership with the development of joint-stock companies. A joint-stock enterprise is a form of collective ownership which may also be used in a socialist economy. We have steered a firm course toward supporting it.

At the same time, the law substantially broadens the opportunities for citizens independently to organize production on the basis of private ownership. All restrictions on any forms of property which can be used in individual labor activity are effectively removed. I must say that the draft law on ownership is the pivot of an integrated system of measures which are contained in the whole package of documents put forward for consideration by the session.

It is precisely in the transformation of the attitude to ownership that the interests of the working people and various social groups are most closely intertwined. It is precisely here that careful consideration of each step is especially important. The draft law is now being worked through in detail in the Committee on Legislation, Legality, Law and Order, and also in the Committee on the Economic Reform, and in other committees. The necessary, more precise formulations will presumably be introduced into this major law to take account of the discussion on it.

II

Comrades, the issue of land relations is the main issue of agrarian policy at the present stage. The need for radical changes in land legislation has arrived. The legal system in effect here is hopelessly out of date. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes which are the main owners of the land manage it fettered by a multitude of normative acts. In the system of economic relations which has become established in the countryside, the peasant has been allotted the role of a hired laborer who, in many respects, has ceased to connect his fate with the land as the fundamental means of production. This has given rise to social passivity and passivity in terms of production, and has had an extremely negative effect upon the development of the whole agroindustrial complex of the country and has hit hard at the provision of food for the population. While separating the land from the peasant as its master, the legislation currently in force has, at the same time, turned out to be powerless in the face of departmental monopolism and has been unable to prevent the mass withdrawal of land from agricultural use. This process has assumed threatening proportions.

So, which mechanism for putting land ownership into effect best satisfies society's new requirements? There are differing points of view on this. Some are proposing splitting the state-owned land up into separate parts and allocating them as the property of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, or citizens. Some are even proposing that we switch to private ownership of the land. Most agrarian scientists and practical workers, however, are convinced that in conditions of a socialist management system there are no grounds for abandoning the people's ownership of the land. The important thing is to change the procedure under which it is made available for use. In other words, the point of the agrarian reform must be not to dismantle the principle of nationalization of the land, nor to abandon state ownership of the land, but to refine the ways in which this is put into effect. The draft law on the land has been based on the appeal from agrarian deputies to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, proposals made by local soviet and economic bodies of the republics, krays, and oblasts and by scientific establishments, and numerous publications on ways of developing agroindustrial production. The government was guided by the following considerations when drawing up the draft: First, the law must ensure conditions for the rational use of land, the regeneration of soil fertility, and the proper protection of land resources; second, it must reestablish the Leninist understanding of land ownership and secure the principle of the sovereignty of local soviets in the sphere of land relations; and third, it must promote the development of all efficient methods of farming the land.

Without summarizing the draft, I would like to dwell on just a few of its fundamental provisions.

Above all, land must remain public property: it cannot be sold or mortgaged. The goal is to create the most favorable conditions for the people who use the land and to genuinely involve the local soviets in this most important matter.

It is the soviets—and no other organs—and the agricultural organizations that are receiving the authority to take charge of the land. Now they will have the right to remove inefficiently used arable land and put it at the disposal of another user who is able to manage it more rationally. This is right since the soviet bears not only full responsibilty for preserving and increasing the fertility of soils, but also for the most important thing, providing the population with food. At the same time, for the first time on a legal footing, the right is secured of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, peasant holdings and other users of the land to independently choose, in the interests of increasing efficiency, the system of farming and the production structure, and to use forest land and areas of water for farming needs, in accordance with established procedure. Interference by state and economic organs in the use of land, granted for tenure is forbidden. In this way both the authority of the soviets in disposing of the land and the right of the users to farm the land independently are guaranteed.

The next question of principle is the payment for land tenure. This does not have a simple history. It is taken for granted that we do not have any payment for land. Formally it is so, but in practical reality rent is collected today. Only it is done on the basis of an extremely contradictory and confused mechanism—the differentiation of purchase prices. The proposed principle of payment for land tenure must be based on a precise and objective economic mechanism. When payment for land becomes an important lever to guarantee equal conditions for farming and a stimulus to rational land use, it will, at the same time, seriously restrain the squandering of land. The following facts reveal that glaring mismanagement is tolerated here: From 1962 to 1987, that is over 25 years, the country newly acquired 26 million hectares of ploughed fields. Direct expenditure on this goal was about R60 billion. That is almost as much as is earmarked for the development of the entire social sphere in the countryside over the 5-year plan period. However, the growth of arable fields in the country amounted to only 4 million hectares.

The point is that, in the same period, 22 million hectares of cultivated land stopped being farmed and was turned over to all manner of nonagricultural production—quarries and other facilities. And 6 million hectares were abandoned altogether and have become overgrown. The introduction of payment for land, along with the steps to promote economically the rational utilization of land envisaged by the draft law, should, in our opinion, put a stop to the irresponsible attitude toward the land. The issue of drawing a line between the competence of the USSR and of the union republics in the field of land relations is tackled in the draft, on the basis of the fundamental provisions of the Law on Property. Evidently, only the job of regulating the basic provisions relating to land-tenure and land-tenure regulations, and the right to dispose of the land in order to satisfy panstate and interrepublican requirements, and the needs of the country's defense and security should remain within the jurisdiction of the USSR. Moreover, this right is to be realized on the joint decision of the supreme executive and management organs of power of the USSR and of the union republics.

In the event that mutually acceptable solutions are not reached, the draft provides for the issue to be examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet, and for it to make the final decision. All other matters relating to the regulation of land relations are to be handed over to the jurisdiction of the republics and the local soviets of people's deputies.

The bill pays particular attention to the issues of land use in areas where small nationalities and ethnic groups live. This is a very acute problem, to which unpardonably little attention has been paid for a considerable length of time.

A consistent policy of maintaining the conditions of normal life and of developing all the peoples of the Soviet Union is a most important and integral part of the nationalities policy of the party and the Soviet state. Particularly close attention must be paid to these issues. Serious hopes for the restructuring of production relations in the countryside are pinned on leasing. The experience that has been amassed testifies to the great effectiveness and huge potential opportunities offered by this form of management. However, we cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that in many places the initiative and independence of lease-holders is being fettered. Sociological research has shown that around 50 percent of lease-holders cannot produce the output that they consider to be necessary and advantageous; 75 percent of them complain of bans on them selling their produce as they see fit, and of restrictions on economic enterprise. The new law is intended to strengthen the legal protection of lease-holders and to create a system of reliable guarantees in their work for any lease-holding collective.

A few words about peasant farmsteads. There are supporters and opponents of them. The latter are scaremongering about a retreat from socialism, the danger of the return of the kulak. In actual fact, however, as life itself demonstrates, such a form is not in contradiction to the socialist system of economy. It is based on personal labor, on independent use of the land, and on individual labor property. The main thing the law gives to peasant farms is a clear guarantee of their right to receive land and to carry out on it agricultural production in equal conditions with other forms of economic operation, and in the first place, with collective and state farms. The formation of farms belonging to peasants and farmers will not be guaranteed by instructions, but by the very logic of their economic life. Of course, we must take account of the objective integrational processes which are taking place throughout the entire agrarian spher .

Peasants and farmers' farms throughout the world are cooperating among themselves and are closely interacting with other sectors of the economy. Their effective development is not possible without it. This process is objectively conditioned in our country, too. The draft, in our opinion, contains an effective enough clause on state control of the protection and use of lands, the stimulation of rational use of land, and in connection with this the use of economic benefits and sanctions.

One more important aspect of the new draft law: In regulating land relations in the interests of the harmonious development of all sectors of the national economy, it gives priority to agricultural production. This concerns in particular the preservation of the most valuable lands. Only by the decision of the Supreme Soviet of a republic can irrigated and drained lands, tilled areas, areas given over to orchards and vineyards, ameliorated hay fields and pasture lands be taken away for nonagricultural needs. In these cases, the full remuneration of losses and lost agricultural production to land users is provided for. Such legal norms will serve to strengthen the guarantees against a wasteful attitude to agricultural land.

There are various points of view on individual clauses of the proposed draft. A number of alternative proposals have also been expressed. They have all been studied thoroughly, and many of them have found reflection in the document under examination. I have to say in all certainty that the main clauses of the draft reflect the position of the government on these questions, which are most important for society.

III

Comrades, we realize that the draft law on socialist enterprises, which has been presented for your examination, may give rise to trenchant discussion. After all, not all that much time has elapsed since the time when the first legal foundations of the restructuring of our economy were created—the Law on State Enterprises; now we have come up against the need for the creation of a new draft law. As you remember, the question of the possibility of preparing an integral law on social enterprise was discussed at the first congress of people's deputies. That is not an accident. Life is moving ahead swiftly. Initiative from below has given rise to new forms of economic operation—lease-hold and joint-stock enterprises, nondepartmental concerns, and others. These nascent forms aleady do not fit into the framework of the adopted laws. Therefore, progressive innovation must not be held up artificially, but legislation must be streamlined more quickly. It must not lag behind the practical development of the reform process.

The very economic environment in which socialist enterprises function is being transformed before our eyes. It is rightful to reckon on the role of the market increasing steadily in resolving such fundamental questions for enterprises as the formation of the production program, and in the system of economic ties and in the area of the sale of products. At the same time, such is reality that a fully-fledged market has not yet been created. Precisely for this reason the law does not represent a rigid construction but leaves room for the further development of the mechanism of economic enterprises. However, it contains important clauses which can accurately, and for a long time, determine the status of enterprises, the procedure for their creation and elimination, their property conditions [imushchestvenniy rezhim] and the legal backing for their activity.

Acknowledging the equality of all socialist producers of goods, the draft law classifies enterprises according to types, depending on their use of the forms of ownership. These are state enterprises, all-union, republican, and communal enterprises of public organizations, leasing, cooperative, and joint enterprises, and also those belonging to joint-stock societies and other economic associations. Relations between the state and enterprise will be built on a fundamentally new basis. Suffice it to say that the new approach to the centralized funds of ministries alone will require the redistribution—chiefly in favor of enterprises—of over R28 billion.

The role of economic regulators is rising sharply: of taxes and tax privileges, interests on loans and securities, prices, the currency exchange rate, depreciation allowance rates, social, ecological, and other norms. The range of nonmarket forms of state regulation is being narrowed to the limits of material and technical resources in short supply, volumes of centralized capital investment, and certain quotas and licences. The system of placing state orders is changing too. They will be obligatory only for state enterprises. But the existence of directives does not at all signify disadvantageousness. The handing out of a state order is accompanied by guaranteed and full provision with centrally distributed material and technical esources. Under present conditions this is sufficient to make them attractive. In the future, on the other hand, the advantageousness of state orders will have to be ensured by economic methods which stimulate enterprises to compete to obtain them.

Bilateral and multilateral contracts should become the basis of the organization of economic relations. The law clearly defines that enterprises have a free choice of the form and subject of a contract, determined by obligations in any other conditions of economic relations. The plans of enterprises will also, to an ever increasing extent, be determined by direct economic ties with wholesale trade, that is on the principles of the socialist market. Freedom for enterprises in planning their economic activity will remain an empty word unless they have sufficient rights in distributing and using their earnings. Up until now this process has been harshly regulated by norms set by directives. The new draft scraps the restrictions in this respect, though it's a point on which many managers and academics are voicing apprehension. Let's take a realistic view of things: One cannot fully rule out the possibility that some collectives will give preference to their immediate interests, to the detriment of production development prospects. Of late, there have been outbursts of narrow group demands at individual enterprises, and these have vividly demonstrated that such a danger really does exist. And this, despite the fact that already in 1990 the wage funds for workers and office staff will be approximately 31 percent up on the 1985 figure, as against the 17.7 percent envisaged by the 5-year plan.

As for the cooperative sphere, it is evident that this year's wage fund will come to R15 billion, with the possibility of a further 50 to 100-percent increase in the future. It is clear that the regulation of such powerful and dynamic processes must be performed at a qualitatively new level. For this reason it is proposed that a system of tax regulation of the way enterprises use their financial resources be introduced. This is not a fiscal measure; the point behind it lies elsewhere. The state will grant substantial benefits to enterprises that plough resources into technical retooling, production modernization, improvements in output quality, and the construction of housing or environmental protection facilities. If, however, consumerist attitudes begin to reign supreme and the aspiration surfaces to increase earnings unjustifiably, to the detriment of technical development, a tax sanction system will come into force automatically. This will tangibly, not through pursuasion but, in cash terms, signal the need to change the chosen path. Thus, knowing in advance the system of taxation conditions, enterprises will be able themselves without any instruction from above to find an optimal correlation between the consumption funds and the production and social development funds formed from their own resources.

The freedom to choose ways of using the resources earned fills with real content the democratic management principles in the enterprise. All this considerably broadens enterprises' self-reliance and opens up new opportunities for efficiency in economic management with the aim of resolving all social, and production issues of a labor collective. However, it is quite understandable that the broadening of enterprises' powers must be accompanied by enhancing their responsibility so that each rouble is backed up by output. Only on this basis is it possible to ensure a balance both at the consumer market and in the production sphere. At the basis of the new economic management system there is above all a high degree of organization, discipline and responsibility. What is impossible without them are real financial autonomy, the transfer to self-financing and self-management, a direct mutual link between wages and the end results of labor. This means that an in-depth psychological perestroyka is needed not only in labor collectives and administration bodies but also in society as a whole. Only on this basis we will be able to overcome the phenomenon, that has long been customary, of enterprises and organizations making losses—there are over 1,700 of these in our agriculture and almost 7,500 in industry and other spheres of the economy. The total size of losses exceeds R5 billion.

In accordance with the draft law, the machinery of redistribution of resources, which allows such enterprises to live and sometimes to lead a comfortable existence at the expense of others, is eliminated. And if the law comes into force from 1991, then little time will remain for restructuring in this matter. Another powerful lever is being introduced: full liability as to property [imushchestvennaya otvetstvennost]. An enterprise which fails to fulfill obligations which it has undertaken will answer to its partners or to the state with all its property, including its fixed assets. And in case of bankruptcy, the property of such an enterprise can be auctioned. This must be seriously pondered by our economic managers, above all, of those enterprises and organizations that have debts and are accustomed to operating at a loss.

I should deal with the subject of the democratization of industrial management. Its optimal combination with unified management and discipline occupies a central place in the proposed draft law. That is not fortuitous.

Practice has shown that we have gone wrong in a number of ways in such matters as the appointment by election of managers of enterprises and the determination of the powers of the labor collective and of its council. This is shown, for example, by the sharp rise in annual turnover of cadres among managers of enterprises. This could not fail to affect labor discipline. As a result, losses of working time in industry and construction alone in the first half of this year have already exceeded 18 milion man-days.

If you think about it, the existing system of forming the management body has, on the one hand, proved to be insufficiently democratic, and on the other, has created serious difficulties in the relations of the managers of enterprises both with their collectives and with the higher administrative bodies.

Can a system be considered democratic when the labor collective elects the head of an enterprise but a higher body has the right not to appoint him to the post, in other words to reject the collective's decision? As world experience shows—as does our experience too—the head of an enterprise must have the necessary powers for as long as these are effective, and not be dependent on the changeable moods of the members of the collective under his management. Otherwise it is simply impossible to organize modern production and guarantee stable high results of economic operation. The function of selecting a leader who has the necessary professional qualities must fall within the competence of the owner of the means of production combined with the appropriate consultation with public organizations and enterprises. That is logical and fair. It is along that path that we are proposing to proceed.

For state enterprises the draft bill envisages, in particular, the nomination of a candidate for the director's post by a higher body and approval of him by a meeting of the labor collective. The collective has the right to reject the candidate proposed to it and in that event it must be offered another. This procedure, by safeguarding the selection of the most competent and businesslike commanders of production, is in our view more democratic for it assumes that the last word in the selection of a leader will belong exclusively to the labor collective. A meeting of the relevant collective will approve the heads of production plants, shop floors, departments, and other sections of an enterprise; while heads of administrative services, deputy directors and middle management are to be appointed to their posts and released by the head of the enterprise.

In this way the democratic process for forming the management body at an enterprise is freed from internal contradictions and becomes more streamlined and rounded off.

Taking into consideration the experience which has been gained, the powers and competence of the general meeting have also been specified more precisely and provisions on the role and place of labor collectives' councils have been formulated more exactly. That is necessary since they are increasingly becoming an active form of participation of the working people in the management of production and resolving socioeconomic tasks. That is on the one hand.

On the other hand, substantial changes are taking place in the activity of trade unions which are handing over a significant part of their powers, particularly in the production sphere, to these councils.

The role of members of the labor collective is being strengthened as is that of trade union and public organizations in leasehold, cooperative and joint-stock enterprises' management bodies. We are taking this step in order to safeguard in reality the socialist nature of all forms of ownership.

Finally, an issue which is of interest to everyone, that is pay. In the new draft the labor income of each worker, regardless of the form of ownership and management, is determined only by final results of work and by the personal labor contribution of each worker and is not restricted by any maximum limit.

Interest and dividends paid out on bonds and acts of the labor collective could become a tangible addition to personal incomes. At state enterprises, where this new form of distribution of income is in use, staff are already getting up to 25 percent of their average earnings in addition. Accumulations of share and part capital will also serve as sources of additional earnings for cooperative and leasehold enterprises. The size of these payments will depend wholly upon how the enterprise operates and what profit it obtains.

As you see, in all matters of organization of production, relations within economic units and salaries, the law draws a precise line rejecting strict regulation on the part of the state. All this becomes the exclusive prerogative of the enterprise and its labor collective.

Such are the fundamental aspects proposed in the draft law. It encompasses all the diversity of economic activity of the socialist enterprise. It reveals fundamental principles in the sphere of price formation, finances, material and technical provision, and the development of foreign economic ties. It is, furthermore, important that the policy of expanding the independence of enterprises and democratization of management imbues every section of the draft law.

IV

Comrade deputies, a draft law "On A Single Tax System of the USSR," which is being adopted in our country for the first time in the last almost 60 years has also been submitted for your consideration. During many decades, our state built its relations with enterprises and payers of taxes and other payments on the principle of confiscating first and then refunding according to the proportion set by the plan and budget. As a result, some paid too much whereas others lived, in effect, at the expense of other people. While this method was used, any economic self-reliance, let alone any interest in boosting accumulations, was out of the question. The different sizes of payments even within a single industry, different benefits, attempts to make individual payment norms fit the specific features of various industries and enterprises, the absence of common criteria for personal taxation—it is as a result of these and other phenomena that we do not at present enjoy healthy economic relations that would allow enterprises and organizations to develop efficiently and interact in a normal way with the state. This is plainly out of step with the fact that, having gained a certain amount of experience, we are now all putting that experience into an understanding of progressive management methods and a definition of social justice.

The government began its preparatory work on the new draft with the assumption that the taxation system should be one of the main tools of economic regulation and should create equal conditions for everyone involved in social production to run their economic affairs and use their earnings. And it is not the state, as embodied in the USSR, the union, autonomous republics, and the local soviets that should adapt to the peculiarities in the work of each object of management, but on the contrary, it is all the enterprises that are bound to be guided in their activities by a single set of requirements and regulations.

This is what we see as the main task confronting the taxation system. It must also ensure social justice in regulating citizens' money incomes; the differences in the levels of these incomes are objective ones and the taxation system must respond sensitively to them.

We are, therefore, talking about a legal enactment designed to resolve several problems within the framework of the current economic reform and, above all, to stimulate economic activity, provide firm guarantees to the primary link in the economy—the socialist enterprise—and to ensure economically justified and socially just redistribution of income. This means that the draft law being submitted is one of the main elements of the economic reform.

The question of deciding what should be taxed has been hotly debated. The draft proposes introducing a tax on profit, as the indicator that most fully describes the final results of the work of each labor collective. This decision is in keeping with world practice.

As for such a category as income, the proceeds of all types of economic activity reduced by the sum of material costs, it is deemed undesirable to take this as an object of taxation, with the exception of the cooperatives, in view of the substantial differences in the proportion of income allotted to wages between enterprises of various branches of industry. This has, in effect, made it necessary to turn once again to individual rates of taxation payments.

First of all, I will deal with the system of payments made by enterprises and organizations to the budget. Its essence is that it should actively promote a decisive turn in the economy toward dynamism and toward simplification of economically accountable relations, stimulate the increase of accumulation without detriment to the economic and financial interests of enterprises, and at the same time guarantee stability in the forming of state's revenue. The draft law is based upon the principle that payments from profits are made through a single channel. The tax payment must be a single payment and the rate stable and clear and understandable to every working person. We consider it possible in this connection to give up something like payment for productive capital in the future. It should be borne in mind that only 28 percent of enterprises are able to make even 3 percent payments for capital. Moroever, doing away with payment for capital considerably simplifies mutual relations with the budget, and this is also not unimportant.

The keystone of any taxation system is the tax rate. Today one often hears from the enterprises that an excessive proportion of the profit they are creating is being taken away from them. The principle embodied in the law starts from the premise that tax should not fulfill the function of an instrument of economic punishment, but ought to stimulate in every way the social and productive development of the enterprises. At the same time, the tax rates must be such as to guarantee budget income at a level that will enable the state and the union republics to finance the expenditure that is laid on them.

The draft provides that the tax on profits will consist of two parts. One of them, going into the union budget, is set firmly at 35 percent. The second is fixed at levels set by the union republics, this part of the tax being paid into their budgets. The total limit of both parts of the tax must not exceed 60 percent of profits. It is taken into consideration here that on account of provision of benefits and introduction of a number of alterations to the calculation of production costs, the norm of payment in comparable conditions will, according to estimate, total 48-49 percent. Calculations show that with taxation at this level, the interests of the enterprises and the interests of the state and republic will be combined.

At the same time it should be emphasized that such a substantial redistribution of the finances of the republics between the state budget and that of the union republics, and also with the part of the profit remaining at the disposal of the enterprises, will naturally lead to changes in financing from the center.

It is well-known that the union and republican budgets finance the bulk of the expenditure on the development of health care, education, and culture; pensions are paid out of it, as are other outgoings on social development; subsidies on agricultural produce are set aside; capital investment is funded, including for the creation of a certain part of the material and technical basis of the social sphere and for the construction of certain very important production facilities in the national economy, and expenditure on administration and defense.

In the proposed draft, the rates of taxation are not arbitrary. They are the result of calculations involving many options, and are based on an analysis of the dynamics of the state's financial resources and the forthcoming redistribution of the functions of the USSR Government, the government of the union republics, and enterprises. The calculations for the draft state plan for the cuntry's economic and social development for 1990 envision the profits of the national economy amounting to R258 billion. That is in the draft plan. Of this, R16[illegible] billion are taxable profit. If the proposed taxation rates were to come into force on 1 January 1990, then the total would be approximately R98 billion. As you know, the draft plan for 1990 envisions enterprises contributing R108 billion to the budget from their profit. It is not hard to see that we do not propose increasing the tax burden of enterprises. Nor should it be forgotten that the priority development of the social sphere, the review of pension legislation and the rapid development of the agro-industrial complex will, in the coming years, inevitably place a greater strain on the budget. Preliminary calculations show that by 1995 just centralized funding and expenditure on social and cultural events alone will increase by R89 Billion, while their share will increase from 22 to 27 percent of all state expenditure. When preparing the law on taxation, we could not ignore this, either. Such calculations and studies of the sizes of tax rates will be submitted to the appropriate committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

With the aim of broadening the rights of the union republics and strengthening their financial bases, it is planned to hand over in full to the competence of the union republics the right to set the size of taxes in spheres such as municipal management, everyday services for the population, and agriculture, including sovkhozes. Taxes levied from enterprises of these spheres must be fully included in the budgets of the union of republics. In preparing the draft law, the question of what the tax benefit system should be like was thoroughly studied. We believe that in this regard we should abandon the approach to this problem that has traditionally taken shape, whereby from ministries, departments, and enterprises, numerous applications stream in for various benefits and advantages to be provided.

Benefits should be exceptional in nature. Their structure can only be dictated by state-wide interests and must not bring us back to the false track of budget payments which are set individually. What should be given priority, however? In our conviction, the tax system must take upon itself refunding part of what an enterprise spends on development and installation of new machinery, on implementation of environmental measures. It should give advantages to enterprises that are being newly created in the areas of the Far East and the Far North. And undoubtedly it is necessary to create powerful incentives to increase production of consumer goods and develop the social sphere. The draft law takes into account these requirements. At present, the higher administrative bodies levy about 8 percent of the profit earned by by enterprises.

The greatest burden here is placed upon highly-efficient enterprises which work steadily. The law envisages that enterprises wil hand over profit to tackle sectorial and intersectorial tasks on a voluntary and mutually-beneficial basis only. Centralized ministerial and departmental funds are being set up to finance the necessary general sectorial scientific and technical programs and also to finance implementation of investment measures to develop sectors; resources are channeled into these funds in the form of deductions from enterprises' taxation payments coming into the union and republican budgets. A real step is thereby being made to overcome the hitherto existing practice whereby the centralized funds of the ministries served as the means of covering every possible kind of expenditure, and frequently mismanagement, including financing loss-making enterprises.

Speaking of a tax on profit, it should also be noted that there is a proposal to introduce at the same time a special regulatory tax on growth of the wage fund. In concert with the tax on profit, this will enable a rational utilization of resources—both to develop production and to pay the wages—to be ensured. The idea is that the specific size of the regulatory tax will be set when the 5-year plans for economic and social development are confirmed.

Alongside the elaboration of a concept for the active influence of tax on the profit of state enterprises, forms and methods have been determined for various types of cooperatives to make payments to the budget.

The peculiarities of the formation and distribution of accumulations by the production cooperatives, kolkhozes, and other cooperative organizations suggest that for them a system for paying into the budget should be established, based not on profit, but on income. These problems were examined in detail at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. There is a proposal to retain the principle approved then. Moreover, it makes sense to switch kolkhozes to the same basic taxation conditions that are employed for production cooperatives, and to switch to calculating tax on earnings net of all production costs.

Comrades Deputies! The problem of the taxation of the personal income of the population is particularly acute. The present situation is that the switch to economic management methods and the consequent rise in wages, plus the extensive development of individual labor and cooperative activity have led to significant changes in the level of the material provision of a certain category of the population, and have given rise to great differentials in the wages of the working people.

At the same time, the system of taxing the income of the population, the principles of which were drawn up in the years when there was strict regulation of the size of pay packets, is not in keeping with the task of redistributing the income of citizens in a socially just fashion, and does not promote a strengthening of the monetary circulation or the restriant of inflationary processes.

In the most painstaking way, the government has examined this matter and considers that there must be a radical reform of income tax. It must incorporate unified principles of taxation of all categories of the population's income, full reckoning of its annual total, the establishment of a single untaxed minimum, the setting of a scale of income tax rates, a move toward the obligatory declaration by the population of its income, and the restructuring of the entire mechanism for deducting and collecting tax. As you know, the draft law on changing the system of taxation of the population's private income was put forward for nationwide discussion. More than 11,000 labour collectives participated in it, as did many thousands of Soviet citizens.

This discussion showed that the main directions have been selected correctly. At the same time, it is perfectly clear that regularization of the personal taxation system must be phased. This is above all because the country is lacking a deep and comprehensive notion of the size of a living wage. It is as yet hard to imagine what real effect on people's standard of living the possible future changes in prices and pensions and other such measures will have. The necessary material basis is lacking for the creation of an extensive network of computer technology to guarantee a complete reckoning of incomes. Finally, tremendous psychological preparation is required for the population to gain a clear understanding of its obligation to declare all its income.

In the near future, as a first stage steps should be taken to raise the untaxed minimum wage and reduce the taxes paid by more than 9 million workers. At the same time, the progression of income tax rates on high earnings is being envisaged. Blue and white-collar workers, cooperative members, writers, and people involved in the arts are placed on an equal rating scale. The system of benefits is being regularized. A clear procedure for the taxation of income received over and above the basic wage is being introduced. The gradual abolition of the tax on bachelors, single citizens, and those with small families is getting underway. In proposing the necessary measures, the government is setting the task of, above all, strengthening social justice, and in doing so is not intending to receive any extra income.

The opinion has been voiced that the untaxed minimum wage would be raised to R100 a month. However, it should be stated plainly that at the present time the opportunities to do this are not open to the state. Of course, as public wealth increases, so will the minimum wage.

One problem that arose during the preparation of the law on a unified tax system was the demarcation of the competence of the USSR and the Union republics in connection with implementing the principles of republican financial autonomy. Following all-round discussion, the firm conviction took shape that, within a federative state such as the Soviet Union, the setting of taxes and the unified methodological principles of collecting them should fall within the competence of the country's supreme legislative body—the USSR Supreme Soviet.

At the same time, along with an extension of the powers to set profit taxes which enter the republican budget—something dealt with earlier on—the Union republics must be given the right to fix rates of taxes on the population—apart from income tax—and on the income of cooperative and other public organizations. They must be given the right to establish additional tax benefits. And finally, the republics must have the right to introduce of their own accord local taxes and duties. All of this is provided for in the draft.

The list of taxes which are being included in the single taxation system under proposal from 1991, as you have been able to observe, does not include certain payments into the budget currently in existence. It is proposed to abolish the tax on income from film showings, and to cancel the agricultural tax in rural areas and the land tax in towns; in exchange, to introduce a payment for land usage, which is to be based on its economic evaluation and will be payable by all enterprises, organizations, and the population. It is also planned to cancel the tax on owners of buildings, and to specify in this regard the scales of compulsory state property insurance. Concrete proposals on these matters will be worked out separately. Bringing this subject to an end, I have to note that the main conceptual provisions have been marked out quite clearly in the draft law. Without doubt, a number of matters will in the course of discussion of this document receive deeper grounding and formulation. The adoption of a law on taxes will require tremendous work in explaining the legislative norms and in bringing its meaning and content to every enterprise, soviet of peopel's deputies, every working man. It is important that all of these provisions should begin to be implemented quickly and correctly.

V

Comrade deputies! Notwithstanding all of the significance of the scientifically grounded concept that has been worked through for economic reform, by no means everything can be precisely forseen in this process. At issue are the living and working conditions of millions of people, their involvement in social creativity. It has to be recognized that, when the main directions of economic reform were formulated in 1987, the role of leasing in the transformation of state property and in enhancing the efficiency of the mechanism of its functioning was not fully realized. The first and most substantial experience in the development of leasing was accumulated in the agricultural sector. In the other spheres of the economy the birth of leasing occurred at initiative from below. Its rapid development throughout the country, at enterprises and organizations, can be explained by the desire of people to open up more fully their possibilities and reserves, to organize their work independently and to earn their own money. The mass transition of enterprises to leasing began at the end of 1988. By the middle of this year there were already 903 industrial enterprises, 449 construction organizations, and 430 retail trade enterprises working on leasehold principles. Leasing relations are developing at a preferential rate at enterprises in the building material industry and the machine building complex. The broad development of leasing enables the strategic tasks of restructuring property relations to be resolved. However, the absence of legal guarantees is giving rise to a lack of confidence among people in the stability of contractual relations, and is holding this process back. It has to be recognized that the legislative initiative was missed in matters relating to the development of leasing relations. The methodological materials and departmental normative acts which were hastily worked out failed to address many of the most important problems connected with determining the economic and legal foundations of leasing, nor did it prove possible immediately to master the experience in the legal regulation of leasing relations that had been accumulated in our country and abroad. The first attempt to formulate an integral legal base for the development of leasing was the decree on leasing and leasing relations in the USSR, and also the corresponding resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers. In summing up their practical application, it can be said that they played their positive role, and created a foundation of its kind for the further development of leasing in the country.

But the provisional nature of these normative acts failed to secure sufficient scope for the development of progressive forms of economic activity. It became evident that a law was needed which might consolidate the specifics of leasing, of the property relations taking shape on its foundation, and of the new principles of running the economy. In the draft legislation on leasing that has been submitted there has been elaborated a qualitatively new model of the financial autonomy activity of enterprises and organizations, and of their structural subdivisions. In its formulation it was taken as a premise that leasing relations make it possible to secure the transformation of property relations at state enterprises, organizations, and kolkhozes. The lessee, without acquiring proprietary rights to the property leased, at the same time becomes its fully entitled owner and also the proprietor of the output produced and the revenue received. This model is not the result of speculative constructions. In the process of preparing the foundations of legislation, experience of work on leasehold terms was pooled and critical observations voiced at the first congress of people's deputies, and also in the mass media, were taken into consideration.

Alternative variants of the law have been considered.

Lease payments have been given new content in the draft which is being presented and the right to acquire collective property has emerged, including the purchase of possessions which in that case become the property of the leasing enterprise, i.e. the work collective.

The right of state enterprises to create independent small lease enterprises on the basis of the property of production facilities, workshops, and other subdivisions is something fundamentally new in the development of lease relations.

Expanding the economic independence of lessees also affects matters relating to payment for labor. The draft legislation on leasing envisages that the wages of members of a lessees' organization be built upon freer principles, although the possibility of lessees voluntarily employing centrally fixed tariffs and salaries is not ruled out.

Lease enterprises create a dividend fund from their own funds. As a result, any improvement in the assets not only pays the lessees dividends, but also reimburses them on closure of the enterprise. In effect, this makes every worker into a co-owner of the lease enterprises.

The very procedure for transferring enterprises to leasing has been drastically simplified. The new, broad rights which the republican bodies and local soviets are getting concerning the disposal of state property and their vested interests in improving the efficiency of economic management will be the strongest possible catalyst for development of leasing and will make it possible to remove the artifical obstacles in its way.

A few words about the development of leasing within an economic unit. The potential of this for providing an incentive is obvious. The most important thing here is to give free rein to the initiative of lease collectives, at the same time not destroying the integrity of the economic machinery of the socialist enterprise. We think that these levers have been found in the bill.

Experience of using leasing in our country and abroad testifies convincingly to the diversity of forms of lease relations in all sectors of the economy. Of course, it is impossible to provide for everything within the framework of a single legislative act. All the more so since particular regional features, national experience and tradition, and the dialectical concept of initiative cannot be left out of the reckoning. This is why the government deemed it essential to submit for the consideration of the People's Deputies not a direct law of the USSR, but the foundation of legislation of the USSR and the Union republics, having in mind that each of the republics would, on the basis of the general principles and in accordance with their own interests, adopt a law on leasing and lease relations which is relevant to local conditions.

Comrade Deputies! The laws submitted for discussion by the second session of the Supreme Soviet are of particular importance for the destiny of the country. They are in tune with the democratic process which is growing both in society and in the economy and are creating a reliable, legal basis for acceleration of restructuring processes in the implementation of political and economic reforms. The Council of Ministers intends to conduct things in such a way that our long-term plans, first and foremost the plan for the 13th 5-year period, incorporate the radical changes in industrial relationships envisaged by the new acts of legislation. The government hopes for fruitful and constructive joint work.

These are the most fundamental provisions upon which I wanted to dwell in my report on the work done to draw up the bills on most important directions of deepening the economic reform. I would like to stress once again that they, in our view, could be an important basis for the elaboration of a legal basis regulating socioeconomic relations in our society.

By their very nature the laws are oriented toward creating a new model for a socialist economy and the development of market relations as long-term and stable factors in increasing production efficiency. These laws to a considerable extent determine the success of perestroyka, that historic cause which we have initiated to renew all aspects of the life of society. In connection with this it is exceptionally important that their provisions become reality and do not remain good intentions. It is extremely clear that the laws under discussion come into full force only amid conditions of a healthy social, political, and economic environment. What do we need for that?

Firstly, to create in society an atmosphere of respect for the laws, to instil faith in firm guarantees that the provisions they contain will be implemented without deviation, forming a firm base for our economy. In the conditions of a law-governed state the role and place of the law as a genuine juridical basis for the functioning of society are drastically altered. Respect for the law must be an unvarying principle, guarding the law against the enroachment of any state bodies, political forces, or public group. Then there would be no instances, as there are now, of unbridled criticism of certain laws having started virtually immediately following their adoption. The drafts need to be discussed carefully on the basis of differing points of view. And should the law, after that, be adopted, it should indeed become a law for all.

Secondly, we need to ensure the political stability of society and eradicate conflicts between nationalities and strikes, which are not backed by reasonable arguments. Pressure on the authorities and threats cannot be a way of overcoming conflicts in a law-governed state. It is the whole people that suffers when emotions start to act against the law. The law must be the basis for solving the problems of the economic independence of the regions, for shaping a reasonable balance of the interests of work collectives, the republics and the country as a whole.

The time has come to turn public opinion and public activity away from acts which destabilize industry and the economy and toward enhancing their stability, efficiency, and movement, on this basis, toward the new social goals. We have to instil in people confidence in today and tomorrow.

Thirdly, we have to change radically the psychological atmosphere surrounding the new forms of economic management. To move on from mistrust and scepticism to support for the decisions which are adopted, backed up by all the resources necessary for this, including political and ideological resources. To make sensible use of the new opportunities offered by teh laws, without permitting an outbreak of group egotism. Only the manifestation of goodwill on the part of the whole soviet people toward the law, tolerance and restraint will create the necessary preconditions for their successful implementation. Among the range of ideological and political measures an important place is to be assigned to explanatory work by all the existing mass media i labor collectives and at all levels of state power and administration. A big role in this process will undoubtedly belong to the USSR People's Deputies.

Fourthly, we have fundamentally to stablize the economic situation in the country. Only then can we talk seriously about transferring to legal norms of regulation on the basis of the laws which are adopted. The measures for the stabilization of the economic situation set out in the 1990 plan and budget should ultimately create the economic conditions necessary for implementation of the provisions of the laws submitted to the session for consideration.

Finally, economic life, economic relationships and links should be regulated by the new legislative basis, which is intended to give real independence to enterprises, oblasts, krays, union and autonomous republics. At the same time it is perfectly clear that authorities and governing bodies at all levels have a duty to act within the framework of the law and to assume management of the economy only by the methods given to those bodies. Everyone has to take responsibility for the decisions which are made. Wilful, subjective actions which run counter to the legislation are now particularly impermissible.

Marrying the mighty potential for creativity and change inherent in the laws being submitted and the intensive work of every day is the essence of the moment and a guarantee of the successful development of restructuring processes.

Ryzhkov Answers Questions

LD0310205189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1636 GMT 2 Oct 89

[Replies to written questions by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the 2 October Supreme Soviet Proceedings in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, several questions have been asked here and replies must be given. Deputies, Comrades Miloserdnyy and Bobritskiy write about the fact that the single taxation system pays little attention to local taxes and that there is no mechanism which regulates local taxes. Well, Comrades, during the elaboration of this section of the taxation law we proceeded from this: that if the law on the single taxation system is adopted, the USSR Supreme Soviet will oversee the relations between the union budget and the republican budget. As for the republican supreme soviets, they will be within their rights and will, apparently, be obliged to work out a mechanism; that is to say, the apportioning of the taxes the republic receives among the autonomous oblasts, towns, rayons and so forth. Our view is that this is a prerogative of the republican supreme soviets and they ought to get this mechanism off the ground. It is hardly necessary for the USSR Supreme Soviet to do this.

Comrade Voronina asks that since Great Patriotic War invalids were not assessed for the purposes of income tax, what are things like now, including of course within this category the Afghan veterans and other internationalist soldiers. I must say that this provision may well have to be strengthened within the law. However, everything, all the exemptions which applied to the Great Patriotic War veterans apply in this law, too. It may well have to be strengthened.

In his note, Comrade Genchev has given us an approximate calculation from the Petrozavodsk paper-making machines scientific and production association. He says that if the new tax rates are applied—as applied to this scientific and production association—then this enterprise will have a smaller tax on the profits at its disposal than is currently the case. Comrades, in my report I wanted, as much as possible, to bring to your notice the following: that, operating with the single taxation rates, some of us will have to lose, while others will, as it were, be better off. This is inescapable. If we again go for setting individual rates we shall again be back where we started from. This is inescapable. That is why, given the single rates in the USSR, there is nothing to stop this scientific and production association from earning even more than it does today. So, the logic here is, as it were, very simple. Let us say that this scientific and production association will get less. But I did say in my report that we have 1,700 collective farms unable to make ends meet at present. We have 7,500 other enterprises which are now in debt, as it were. In the first instance, it is these farms and enterprises that must stop and think, for, otherwise, they will simply be unable to exist from 1991 if the law is adopted. That's logic; thats what financial autonomy consists of.

Comrade Ardzinba says that in accordance with the new laws, the rights to land and resources ought to be made available not just to republics and other formations. Comrade Gabriyelyan likewise asks about this. Well, the draft law that has been presented and which you have today taken on board, as it were, states... we have put forward proposals concerning land ownership being vested in the union and the republics. I will not reiterate this; the report dealt with this and the draft documents set it out quite precisely. One thing is clear: that, in my view, if necessary, the union republics have a right to hand over the landowner's powers to [words indistinct] autonomous formations. I do not rule out this possibility. Maybe during the course of further work this question deserves to be thoroughly thought out, so that it may be reflected.

Comrade Bosenko asks when the draft law on pension provisions will be presented to the Supreme Soviet. It will be presented strictly according to schedule, determined by a decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in October this year. In October this draft will be presented to the Supreme Soviet.

Comrade Skulme asks this question: I create cultural values. The values I created, are they of the all-Union significance, in quotation marks, or are they of republican significance? According to the logic of the draft law, it is this way: If I am a USSR people's artiste, then they are all-Union. But I would much rather see them as belonging to humanity writ large or to the world as a whole. Comrades, you will have noticed that the draft law has a special footnote which says that, I mean, the questions connected with the creation and utilization of the works of literature and art will be governed by a special statute. I would be very happy and glad to see the works which have an all-human nature being called all-human.

Why is it that Lithuania and Estonia's transition to financial autonomy is going through the USSR Supreme Soviet, while in Belorussia it is done by a decision of the USSR Council of Ministers? Comrades, we have examined this issue. There was a legislative initiative from the three Baltic republics, to the effect that the Supreme Soviet should adopt a decision in principle to let them go over to this question, but, as it were, it based itself, it, I mean, constructed its whole concept of going over to financial autonomy upon those basic provisions which, I mean, the Supreme Soviet deputies have, as you know... [changes thought] the draft law exists and they have taken it all as the basis. They agreed with this draft, they signed it and that is why everything that has been done as far as Belorussia is concerned is based precisely on this draft. That is why I think that it is perfectly correct for them not to have asked for some other draft law. In this case we have examined all the particulars, all the specific details essential for Belorussia's transition to financial autonomy at the Supreme... in the USSR Council of Ministers and it was also on 1 September that the Supreme Soviet decision was signed, where everything was, as it were, put it in its proper order. I reported some figures in my report today. That is why I regard this as a perfectly legitimate act.

Comrades, I have all the notes. Taking this opportunity of being able to address the people's deputies yet again, I would like...I am firmly convinced that the brief exchange of views on the proposed drafts of laws of fundamental importance for our country's economic development, well, they make it possible, in the joint work, a fruitful work, both of the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet in conjunciton with the permanent bodies of the Council of Ministers and, above all, of course, with the Commission on Economic Reform, they make it possible to put in some more work on them, to make them more thorough, to add things here and there and, I mean, to have a bit of discussion, so that we may go through this work very quickly indeed, over a short period of time, to make it possible to present these documents for specific examination during the USSR Supreme Soviet session. Even today's brief exchange of views on these basic documents bears witness to the fact that we are evidently on the correct path, but a more in-depth working-through is needed and we will do all we can so that fruitful work makes it possible for us to resolve these questions which are very serious as far as our country's life is concerned.

Here Comrade (Shchedrin) has handed me a note about setting up a Gasprom concern. We shall examine it separately, it is a private question.

Moscow Radio on 3 Oct Supreme Soviet Proceedings

1502 GMT

LD0310163289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 3 October begins a recorded relay of the 3 October USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow. Gorbachev is chairing the session. He begins by inviting the deputies to register. There are 426 deputies. Voronin is due to speak but he has not arrived yet.

At 1502 GMT an unidentified deputy urges others to tackle the issue of strikes in a businesslike way; the draft law is ready. Indistinct questions from the floor follow. Gorbachev says that the government stand on the railroad situation has been defined. He invites Deputy Gritsenko to speak on the draft law on labor conflicts.

At 1505 GMT Gritsenko speaks for 38 minutes about how the draft law was developed and who worked on it. He says labor conflicts should be resolved peacefully and strikes should be avoided. He quotes public support to this effect. He goes on to clarify the background of the law explaining that previous legislation was inadequate. We should draw upon our historical experience and international practice; he continues. Later he reviews strike regulations in other countries and describes the main provisions of the draft law. Only a court can deem a strike illegal, he concludes.

At 1543 GMT Gritsenko answers questions on political strikes. Political pressure cannot be applied to solve labor problems, he says.

At 1546 GMT an unidentified speaker asks about compensation for the damage caused by strikes.

The recorded relay continues.

1550 GMT

LD0310165589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 3 October USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1550 GMT an unidentified speaker asks a question about strikes in defense of civil rights. Gritsenko says their sphere was only labor conflicts.

Deputy Moshnyaga from Moldavia asks about measures against those who force people to strike as happened in Moldavia recently. Gritsenko says that secret ballot could be a solution. He agrees with another speaker that time limits for examining conflict issues should be set. Only the court can decide whether a strike is illegal, he reiterates.

At 1605 GMT a Latvian deputy asks for more details on political strikes and on incitement to strike. Gritsenko agrees to look into the matter.

Deputy Valov suggests they should stop discussing the law and instead get down to examining the situation in the country. Gorbachev says that is what they were going to do anyway.

At 1611 GMT the discussion of the draft law starts. An unidentified deputy speaks in support of the draft. Political struggle should not involve strikes, it could take the form of rallies and demos instead, he says. The reconciliatory methods for solving labor conflicts suggested by the draft are good, he states. The draft stresses responsibility of the striking enterprise before related enterprises; the draft could be improved yet but on the whole it is an achievement, he concludes.

At 1620 GMT Gorbachev invites Voronin to speak. Voronin says they worked nearly all night elaborating the document on emergency measures to ensure that the country's transport system works. He goes on to give the background to their efforts.

At 1625 GMT Gorbachev asks whether questions should be in written form. He goes on to give his considerations about the situation in the Supreme Soviet. At 1630 GMT Tetenov, chairman of transport commission, speaks. He reads a decree banning strikes in power industries. Strict measures should be applied to decree breakers, he says, and the safety of transport workers in the Transcaucasus should be ensured.

At 1635 GMT Gorbachev announces a 25-minute break.

The supreme soviet morning session ends.

The recorded relay continues.

1635 GMT

LD0310180789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 3 October USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1635 GMT in the recorded relay Gorbachev opens the evening session. He suggests the deputies discuss the draft clause by clause. There is a vote on this suggestion which is carried. Discussion of clause 1 begins.

Deputy Kugultinov says the draft should be renamed a law on strikes because the word conflicts is a euphemism. Gritsenko says that conflicts is a broader idea.

Deputy Ivashko supports the name but suggests amending it. Another deputy from Leningrad is in favor of Kugultinov's proposal. Medvedev suggests adding the word strike to the title. Others such as Sobchak and Ivanov support this idea. Discussion of the title continues.

At 1659 GMT Gorbachev puts the title to a vote: the original title is approved.

At 1702 GMT Clause 1 is submitted for discussion. Cochairman Samarin of the commission calls on deputies to be more businesslike in their proposals, and to adopt the draft considering the nearly emergency situation in the country.

Deputy Ivanov suggests amending the clause to include conflicts with the government and gives examples from Leningrad's experience. Gorbachev puts clause 1 to the vote. It is passed.

At 1716 GMT discussion on clause 2 begins. Deputy Kirillov gives his views. Samarin speaks about powers of strike committees. The deputies then discuss who should lead a strike.

At 1726 GMT clause 2 with clarifications is put to the vote and carried.

At 1727 GMT discussion on clause 3 begins. Deputy Golik says he is against labor arbitration because it will duplicate already existing bodies. Clause 3 is passed.

At 1732 GMT clause 4 is discussed. Various amendments are suggested. Chairman of the State Committee for Labor and Social Affairs, Shcherbakov, suggests amendments on the establishment of conciliation and arbitration mechanisms obligatory for both sides. an unidentified deputy speaks about the need to clearly state the procedure for the formation of conciliation or arbitration commissions. another deputy expresses reservations about the various time limitations imposed on the resolution of disputes. Sobchak shouts an inaudible response from the hall. Another deputy expresses his reservations about the work of the working group on preparing the bill.

At 1750 GMT Gorbachev calls for a vote. Clause 4 is adopted.

The recorded relay continues.

1754 GMT

LD0310191989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 3 October USSR Supreme Soviet Session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1754 GMT Gorbachev asks deputies on the procedure for taking the next items, whether to vote for the clauses as a whole followed by the amendments. The established procedure is to be continued.

At 1759 GMT a deputy speaks on clause 5. There is a suggestion that labor arbitration should lie with the courts. Deputy Alekseyev and others speak on the proposal with regard to the courts being involved, and express their reservations.

At 1807 GMT Gorbachev asks for a vote on the alternative draft of clause 5. Clause 5 is passed in its original form.

At 1810 GMT a deputy expresses serious concern at the way in which voting has been conducted, especially with regard to proposed amendments. A number of voices are heard in the hall. One deputy speaks against voting on the run. Another deputy says that what is being discussed in terms of voting procedure is of the utmost importance for the future operation of the Supreme Soviet and speaks of the need for detailed and considered work in committee, which would provide detailed documents to deputies, for them to consider.

At 1818 GMT Gorbachev sumarizes the voting options, asking: "How are we to operate." Again he asks for a vote.

At 1825 GMT Gorbachev introduces the discussion on the transport problem, and hands over to Ryzhkov who stresses the urgent need to resolve this problem. Ryzhkov refers to the need to resolve the Armenian-Azerbaijan problem by political means. He then puts forward a draft bill aiming to ensure disruption-free operation of the railways, and the need for the supreme soviet to take immediate measures to end the illegal actions. He proposes the ending of strikes in this sector until the proposed law is adopted.

A narrator intervenes to say that after a discussion, the proposals put forward by Ryzhkov were adopted with amendments: no voting figures are given.

At 1834 GMT the recorded relay ends.

Further Reportage on 3 Oct Supreme Soviet Session

'Heated Debates' Held

LD0310112589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1000 GMT on 3 October carries a 3-minute report by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy from the Kremlin on the Supreme Soviet proceedings thus far. He notes that before the break two documents were discussed, namely the procedure for resolving labor disputes and the decision on urgent measures for guaranteeing the uninterrupted operation of the railroad and of basic sectors of the national economy. There were heated debates before the break at 1200 [0900 GMT] and they are continuing now, he says. "Opening the sitting after the break, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev called upon deputies to be responsible in their speeches and to concentrate on the main issue—on decisions which would permit the normalization of the situation in the country," Ruvinskiy says.

According to Ruvinskiy, Deputy Sozinov was the first to continue the debate after the break. He asked to whom should the demands for normalizing the situation be addressed now—the Supreme soviet, the government, or local bodies of power? "He also spoke of the exacerbation of the situation in Tatariya, the republic which he represents, in connection with the construction there of a nuclear power station", Ruvinskiy says. He quotes Sozinov as saying that loss caused by the strikes should be refunded from the local budget.

Ruvinskiy says that Deputy Yablokov spoke on behalf of the coordinating council of the interregional deputy group. He noted that a law on emergency measures was needed to lift the blockade, not the introduction of troops, and that some of the measures in the law are "unrealistic".

Ruvinskiy names other deputies who spoke: Deputy Kolesnikov, a railway worker from Rostov, proposed that full economic responsibility be laid on the republican governments for the events in their territories, and that they should recompense enterprises and every citizen as well; Deputy Bogdanov asked why the militia is not now making use of its rights in republics where the situation is complex; Deputy Ambartsumyan introduced a number of proposals.

Draft Strike Law Discussed

LD0310121789 Moscow TASS in English 1211 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—by TASS parliamentary correspondent:

A draft law on the settlement of collective labor disputes (conflicts), currently under discussion by the Supreme Soviet, is designed to protect workers' interests and create better conditions for dialogue with the management.

The deputies approved main provisions of the draft in the first reading last summer. The document was then submitted for editing to the parliament's standing bodies.

In presenting the draft to the deputies today, the chairman of the Standing commission of the council of the Union for Labor, Prices and Social policy, Nikolay Gritsenko, stated that the bill proposes a five-day period for dispute to be studied by a conciliatory commission set up on a parity basis by the conflicting parties.

If both parties fail to reach agreement, they have the right to apply to labor arbitration which is to pass its ruling within seven days. If the differences are not settled at this level, the work collective may resort to a strike as the ultimate measure.

Commenting on the draft, Gritsenko pointed out that it raises the level of responsibility of all managerial bodies and officials and will, therefore, strengthen production discipline.

Its application will help overcome impulsive actions by work collectives, he believes.

Yuriy Kalmykov, deputy chairman of another parliamentary committee, that deals with issues of legislation, legality and law- and-order, drew attention to the importance of changes made to the text of the draft law on strikes.

The bill says that the interests of a work collective may be represented by any body (a trade union committee, a council of the work collective and so on), rather than by the trade union alone, as stipulated in the first version of the document.

The draft law describes as unlawful strikes connected with demands for the violent overthrow or change of the state and social system or demands leading to violations of ethnic and racial equality.

The document envisages material and juridical guarantees for workers who use legal means to resolve labor disputes. Only the Supreme Soviet of the USSR or of a union republic would have the right to put off the strike or suspend it for a period of up to two months.

Strikes are banned if they jeopardise the life or health of people. No strikes are allowed at railway and city public transport enterprises, in civil aviation, communicaitons, power engineering, defence industries and state bodies.

At the proposal of the chairman of the sitting, the deputies put off the discussion of the draft law until afternoon and started debates on the government's draft resolution on measures to ensure the normal functioning of the railway transport and key branches of the national economy.

Resolution on Action To Normalize Railways

LD0310140189 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent: Urgent moves to normalise the operation of transport in Transcaucasia, where railway traffic between Azerbaijan and Armenia has been at a standstill for two months now, are an integral part of a package of measures up for the Soviet parliament's consideration to ensure an uninterrupted functioning of railway transport and basic branches of the country's economy.

The document is the Supreme Soviet's draft resolution elaborated after parliament's Monday [2 October] meeting. It was presented to the deputies by First Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin on Monday.

The draft resolution, which today became the subject of keen discussion at a joint meeting of the two houses of parliament, suggests in particular that local authorities should be given a week to normalise the operation of railways in Transcaucasia. If this is not done before October 9, the document envisages transferring the management of the railways directly to the USSR Ministry of Railways.

President Mikhail Gorbachev, who is presiding over the session, drew the deputies' attention to the importance of immediately removing the elements of disorganisation which have manifested themselves in the operation of the basic branches of the economy. He pointed out that the government should be given an opportunity to do everything necessary to ensure the normal functioning of transport and the power industry, in the first place.

Many deputies supported the idea of putting the question in this way. Nikolay Sazonov, a deputy from the Tatar Republic, said that material damage inflicted upon the country's economy should be offset at the expense of respective republics, and not at the expense of the state budget.

During the discussion a number of deputies objected to the application of emergency measures without clearly defining time limits and regions where they would be applied. Many speakers pointed to the insufficient clarity of formulations in the document submitted by the governnment.

Valentin Tetenov, chairman of the Council of the Union's commission on Transport, Communications and Information Science, suggested that the parliament consider an alternative resolution version prepared by his commission.

This document is based on a demand for absolute compliance with the country's current laws, Tetenov emphasised. It also suggests banning work stoppages on transport, enterprises of the fuel and energy sector, metallurgy and petrochemistry pending the adoption of a law on the procedure for the resolution of collective labour disputes.

Following a two-hour discussion the deputies called for yet another, more thorough elaboration of the draft resolution in committees and commissions with the participation of the government.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is expected to return to this question again this afternoon.

Ryzhkov Reads Transcaucasus Draft

LD0310202289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Oct 89

[From the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session Diary" program, presented by Marina Novitskaya]

[Excerpt] [Novitskaya] In the evening session the deputies managed to discuss and vote for five articles of the law out of a total of 15. Then the floor was passed to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. But before that I will tell you that the second variant of the draft decision of the Supreme Soviet on urgent measures to ensure the work of railway transport was not adopted by the deputies at the morning session. It was again decided that all commissions and all the deputies involved should gather, together with the government, and, under Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzkov's guidance, to work out a final variant, which—this was the wish expressed—would be concrete, clear, and precise. So, at the end of the evening session, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov went to the platform.

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] We have all come to the unanimous opinion that the situation which has developed in our country's economy today will in many ways be determined by how the main branches of the national economy operate. We believe this concerns, in the first instance, rail transport and, in some areas, motor vehicle transport as well. This concerns in the first instance the fuel and energy complex; in other words, fuel extraction, electrical power, electricity transmission, the supply of gas, oil, and so on, the work of thermal power stations, the work of power stations in general, the work of metallurgy, and the work of the chemical industry. These are the main branches which must predetermine not only the development of the national economy as a whole, but first and foremost to provide our population's vital needs, especially during the winter period. This is a particularly hard time for the life of our country, as it always has been, and therefore if we do not take special measures now we could be faced with a situation where many towns and republics find themselves in an extremely serious situation. Therefore it is our opinion that we must adopt a special decision in order to rivet the attention of all our people to this problem and to impose the proper order where necessary.

I will now read out the proposed decision, but before I do, I must express the opinion of those people's deputies who took part in the examination of this question, and our common opinion, the opinion of the government, that we consider these to be truly special measures, measures which are dictated by life itself. But if we are to speak about an individual region of our country, about the Transcaucasus, or to be more precise, the situation which has developed between Azerbaijan and Armenia, our opinion is that: We must tackle this question in the nearest possible future by political means. It is only in this direction that we can find a solution, and it is only in this direction that we can stabilize the situation which has developed there and which prevents both peoples alike from living a tolerable life.

This is our firm view, and we would like to ask the Supreme Soviet to consider this problem in the immediate future, so that this main source of the enormous tension that has formed in the Transcaucasus, first and foremost between these two republics, is finally removed. This is our firm view, and it is my duty to report it to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

This first concerns the matter of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. A political solution has to be adopted.

Now I will read a draft for a Supreme Soviet decision on urgent measures to ensure uninterrupted operation of rail transport and fundamental sectors of the national economy.

In consideration of the complex economic situation in the country brought about by stoppages in the work of rail transport and a number of fundamental sectors, which is having a negative effect on the work of the national economy, the USSR Supreme Soviet decides:

1. In order to ensure uninterrupted supplies of freight and steady provision of fuel, foodstuffs, and manufactured goods to the population, especially during the autumn-winter period, the supreme soviets and councils of ministers of the union republics, the USSR ministries and departments, the executive committees of local soviets of people's deputies, and managers of enterprises are to take urgent measures to cut short unlawful actions which interfere with transportation operations.

2. With particular regard to the existing intolerable situation on the Transaucasus railroads, all bodies of state administration in the region are instructed:

To restore immediately normal train traffic on every sector of the aforementioned railways; to entrust to the USSR Council of Ministers the management of these railways where this is necessary; to entrust directly to the

USSR Ministry of Railways the protection of individual sections and vital support facilities of the activities of the aforementioned railways and also of bridges and tunnels; to ensure the safety of transportation workers and citizens by entrusting this to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the USSR Ministry of Railways.

3. In connection with the fact that the stable work of the national economy is ensured by timely perparation for work in winter conditions by transportation enterprises, the fuel and power complex, metallurgical and chemical enterprises, by the high- quality overhaul of equipment, by the creation of normative reserves of fuel, raw, and other materials at these places, strikes are to be banned at these enterprises until the appropriate law is adopted.

To grant the right to the councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, kray and oblast soviets of peoples deputies to alter in the winter period, in agreement with the power supply enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Power, the work regime of the enterprises and other sectors of the national economy located on these territories, including the alteration of rest days, alterations to the start and finish of work shifts, the establishment of timetables for the work of enterprises on the basis of existing resources of electric power and the capacities of power stations.

4. To entrust the USSR Council of Ministers and the corresponding committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet with elaborating by 1 November 1989 a USSR draft law on emergency measures, and by 1 December 1989 a USSR draft law on railway transport.

5. The USSR Supreme Soviet condemns the use of illegal and violent methods of actions to resolve questions of the country's socioeconomic and political life.

That is the proposal of the Supreme Soviet deputies who took part in the work, and that is the view of the government on the matter. [end recording]

[Novitskaya] One other excerpt I want to bring to your notice. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov is answering deputies' questions.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified deputy] Nikolay Ivanovich, I'd like to ask this question—not of you, but of the leaders of the ministries and departments who are named in the decision: What is their view? Does the adoption of such a decision enable the problem to be tackled fundamentally?

[Gorbachev] Well, they probably all took part. Nikolay Ivanovich could say.

[Ryzhkov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I'll answer that question and will express an opinion. The matter was given very serious discussion today. There was a proposal to confer special powers on the government, not only in connection with the Transcaucasian railways, but, in general, to confer powers on the government in connection with the country's main rail routes. On behalf of the government I expressed my disagreement with that idea. One cannot today adopt a decision that covers the whole country. It is impossible to govern the country, as they say, with the help of the military. That is impermissible. [Some shouting heard in the background] The country cannot then function normally. One can only tackle a single issue. The ministries, too, share that view. [end recording]

[Novitskaya] I think that no comments are required here, but I will add that, after discussion, the draft decision "On urgent measures to ensure the work of rail transport and the basic sectors of industry" was adopted—admittedly, with substantial amendments.

Further on Railroad Operation

LD0310231289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 3 October begins carrying a recorded relay of the 3 October USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin.

During the discussion following Ryzhkov's proposal on ways to ensure the operation without disruption of the railroads, an unidentified deputy says he has already submitted the proposal that servicemen of the Ministry of defense should not take part in these measures. We would, he says, be going against our sacred oath which is to defend the motherland whereas this is a question of internal functions. Therefore, he asks that these servicemen should not be used for this purpose.

Ryzhkov replies:

"We believe that the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs should perform the main function of security. At the same time we have strategic objects which are part of the railways such as bridges, tunnels and so on which we need today and which we need tomorrow. Therefore it is our opinion that because these objects are of strategic importance and evidently, if we take into consideration their significance, individual objects such as tunnels, bridges, can be and we believe should be entrusted to the USSR Ministry of Defense."

Later in the relay another unidentified deputy asks if there was any request for help in solving any of the conflicts from the republican Supreme Soviets, Councils of Ministers or party Central Committees? Did we have any appeals for help, he asks. Ryzhkov replies:

"I have received no written request because it was only yesterday I started on this problem, but yesterday's speech and today's speech at the session which lasted fairly long are in line with the opinion of the republican leadership."

Ryzhkov is then asked a further question by a different unidentified deputy who enquires: "Is there a guarantee that trains will move tomorrow?"

Ryzhkov gives the following reply:

"I have said everything I can. Thereafter it is up to the will, the goodwill of people. I want to say once again, comrades, that we must come to our senses. We must come to our senses and start thinking sensibly. We can no longer go on doing things the way that we are. So in my view, the discussion—yesterday's discussion and today's discussion with the active participation of the deputies of the Supreme Soviet—one has to presume that both the people of Azerbaijan and the people of Armenia and everybody will hear. A decision has to be taken to ensure that traffic is immediately restored, so that we don't apply the second paragraph of the second point. What we need is normality. If, however, we don't see...if in fact there are no changes, well, then it will be necessary to apply those powers which I hope you will give the USSR Council of Ministers today."

At 2015 GMT the recorded relay ends.

Rail Transport Discussed

PM0410105589 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 4 Oct 89 p 1

[Report by "our parliamentary correspondents" M. Rostarchuk and L. Telen: "No Delays Tolerated"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] On Monday 2 October at the evening sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers, abandoning for a while the debates on the planned draft laws, the people's deputies discussed the government's request to grant it extraordinary powers to introduce order in transport, primarily rail transport, and also in the base sectors of the national economy. [passage omitted citing Voronin address to deputies]

The deputies' speeches stressed that the railroads, like other general state transport systems and like the base sectors of industry, cannot be used as small change for resolving interethnic or labor conflicts.

At the same time a number of deputies, in particular Academician A. Sakharov, expressed doubt that the government should acquire extraordinary powers, believing that this approach is nonetheless not suited to the situation. The deputies decided to continue the debate on the morning of 3 October.

The 3 October morning session. The auditorium tensely awaited the government's new proposals. L. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers was late: During the night the government, with the participation of parliamentary committees and commissions, had reworked the draft decision. S. Alekseyev took the floor. Some of the measures we were talking about yesterday will be revised in the law on labor disputes, he said. He suggested the parallel examination of the draft law which has been prepared. A report on this subject from the Commission on Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy was delivered by the commission's chairman, N. Gritsenko.

Then L. Voronin took the floor. The government, he said, has taken into account the deputies' comments and the draft law on labor conflicts which has already been prepared. Now, as emerges from the draft, the Council of Ministers does not demand extraordinary powers. Instead urgent measures are proposed which will help introduce order on the railroads and at the base sectors of the economy. They include the following: "If the work of the railroads has not been returned to normal by 9 October 1989, the leadership of these railroads should be assigned directly to the USSR Ministry of Railroads." Forces of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the Ministry of railroads itself must be brought in to guard them. In addition it is proposed, considering that the cold weather is near, that strikes at chemical and metallurgical enterprises and enterprises of the fuel and power complex be outlawed. And also that the government be instructed to elaborate before 1 March 1990 draft laws "on extraordinary measures" and "on the USSR's transport."

Alas, other measures—and many participants in the debates which erupted after L. Voronin's speech emphasized this—bear little resemblance to urgent measures. And indeed, is discipline in transport not the direct duty of the railroad workers? And must the republics' governments be specially told that they are responsible for the work of "their own" transport?

These were the "measures" which Deputy Denisov called futile. He called the draft submitted by L. Voronin an attempt by the government to shift its guilt for past errors onto the Supreme Soviet.

Denisov was supported by Deputies Yablokov, Kolesnikov, and a number of others. They all agreed on one thing: Precise and effective government measures are needed, and they are lacking in the draft. Some deputies sharply opposed deferring immediate actions until 9 October: It is already clear, they said, that it is impossible to normalize the situation on the Azerbaijan railroad without intervention from the center. We must act immediately: If not today then tomorrow.

Again there was an eruption of emotions. As always there were grounds for this. The disorders in transport, the deputies said, are political, not economic phenomena. The Armenian deputies demanded that the blockading of the republic be denounced and that it be given a political assessment. Deputy Lauristin spoke of the impermissibility of strikes as political blackmail threatening the normal life of whole regions. She suggested preparing a draft law "on terrorism" which would equate actions like economic blockade with terrorist acts.

...When the session ended the debates, there wer 20 people remaining on the list of those who had signed up to speak. A decision was deferred again. The deputies suggested to the government that during the 2-hour break, with the participation of the Supreme Soviet of the committee and commissions [as published], it again rework the document under discussion and resubmit it for examination by the session. The session continued its work in the evening.

Decision on Transportation, Strikes Adopted

LD0310182189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

A decision adopted today by the USSR Supreme Soviet on urgent measures to ensure the uninterrupted functioning of railway transportation and vital sectors of the economy is directed at overcoming negative processes in the most important industries of the national economy. A report on a new version of this document was delivered at the evening session by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

We recall that after 2 hours discussion on this matter at the morning session the deputies again, as on Monday, adopted a decision on a further refinement of the document. Following brief but sharp discussion, the Soviet parliament approved proposals prepared by people's deputies and the government of the country.

With the aim of ensuring an uninterrupted supply of freight and a stable supply to the public of fuel, foodstuffs, and manufactured goods, the USSR Supreme Soviet proposed that all the bodies of legislative and executive power in the country adopt immediate measures to put an end to illegal acts which interrupt the work of transportation.

Having defined the situation on the railways of the Transcaucasus as intolerable, the Soviet parliament obliged all state governmental bodies in the region to restore normal railroad traffic immediately. In doing this, the government of the country is instructed where necessary to hand over management of these railways to the USSR Ministry of Railways, and to entrust the guarding of individual sectors of track and railway installations and the ensuring of the safety of transportation workers and citizens to the USSR Ministries of Internal Affairs, defense and railways.

The decision prohibits strikes at transportation enterprises and those in the fuel and power complex, metallurgy and chemicals until the relevant law is adopted. In agreement with the enterprises, local soviets have been given the right to alter work schedules at enterprises in the winter period and to alter days off, depending upon the supplies of electricity available.

The government of the country has been instructed, in conjunction with the parliamentary committees and commissions, to draw up by 1 November 1989 a draft law of the USSR on emergency measures and by 1 December 1989 a draft law on railroad transportation.

The USSR Supreme Soviet condemned the use of illegal, violent methods and actions in resolving issues of the country's socioeconomic and political life.

The next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is planned for Monday, 9 October.

Proceedings Reviewed

LD0310203289 Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Supreme Soviet today passed a resolution on urgent measures to restore normal rail service and ensure the uninterrupted operation of other key economic sectors.

The resolution instructs all legislative and executive agencies in the country to act without delay to stop illegitimate activities from disrupting transport operations and supplies of food, fuel and other goods.

Describing the standstill at the railways in the Transcaucasus region as intolerable, the parliament bound all local authorities to immediately restore the rail service.

It also instructed the government, if need be, to hand the administration of these railways directly to the Central Railways Ministry and entrust the protection of individual sections of the railways and related facilities as well as railwaymen and passengers to the interior, defence and railways ministries.

The resolution bans strikes on transport, in the fuel and power industries, and in metallurgy and the chemical sector pending a relevant law.

Also today, the parliament examined the second version of a bill on collective labour disputes.

Presenting the draft, Nikolay Gritsenko, chairman of the Council of the Union's standing commission for labour, prices and social policy, said that the document proposes a five-day period for a dispute be studied by a conciliatory commission set up on a parity basis by the conflicting parties.

If they fail to reach agreement, they will have the right to apply to labour arbitration which is to pass its ruling within seven days. If the differences are not settled at this level, the work collective may resort to a strike as the ultimate measure, according to the bill.

During the afternoon sitting the Supreme Soviet began to discuss it clause by clause and approved the first five of the 15 clauses, after which it decided to continue the job at the next sitting next Monday, October 9.

Committees, Commissions Agenda for 4 Oct

LD0410061889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] USSR Supreme Soviet deputies are today working in committees and commissions. Members of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission of the Soviet Union will gather in the Kremlin. On the agenda are the problem of the material balancing of the state plan for next year and resourse-saving tasks. Representatives of many departments and specialists have been invited to the session. Discussion will continue of the draft laws that are to be submitted for consideration by the current session. The Committee for Economic Reform, for example, proposes to discuss the draft law on general principles for management of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics. The Committee for Public Health intends to consider the proposals of Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions on state social insurance and improving labor conditions and protection measures. The future law on general principles for local economy and local self-government will be the focus of attention of the commission for the work of the soviets.

'Intensive' Work Viewed

LD0410122189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Our commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy is at the microphone.

[Ruvinskiy] Today the deputies are working in the commissions and committees. The draft plan and budget for next year are being examined. In addition, work is also being conducted on various draft laws, and the preliminary examination of them is under way.

Thus, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies, Development of Government and Self- Government is examining the ussr draft law on general principles of local self-government and local autonomy.

The Committee on Affairs of Women, Family Care, Motherhood, and Children will focus its attention today on the draft laws on constitutional supervision in the USSR and on pension provisions.

At the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee sessions on Agrarian Issues and Food it is proposed to devote most of the attention to the solution of social problems in the villages and to questions of scientific-technical progress in the agroindustrial complex.

To return to the plan and budget for 1990, the most detailed discussion on the problems which have arisen in connection with them is of course being conducted at the USSR Planning and Budget and Finance Commission. The extent to which the state plan for next year is balanced and the targets for resource saving are being examined today. Two reports have already been heard. Comrade Malakhov spoke on behalf of Gosplan and Mostovoy, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, spoke on its behalf. Both speakers assured that priority in material and technical supplies will be given to production for state orders. All requirements for the output of consumer goods and the requirements of enterprises producing food products are being met in full. However, some deputies expressed doubts that the industrial ministries really will receive all the resources they need and that requirements will be met in full.

Deputy Filshin, for instance, said he believes that the USSR Gosplan and the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply must give written undertakings to the ministries who assume responsibility for producing particular common goods to the effect that their requirements will be met. In turn, these ministries must also sign written undertakings for the production of goods in definite quantities and of a definite product range. It is very important, for example, when the plan is being approved, to know where disruptions in supplies are possible, so that these do not arise unexpectedly in the course of the year. It is already clear, for example, that the country is going to experience grave difficulties in the production of various packaging materials. There is a lack of polymers and foils for this purpose, and there is no possibility of buying the raw materials for them on the foreign market.

All in all, the work is progressing in a fairly intensive way. In the course of it a considerable amount of emotions are being displayed, but a common, mutually acceptable version of the plan has to be found. It is already apparent that it will not be possible for the plan to meet all the demands put forward by the deputies. Preliminary calculations show that it would be necessary to increase the state budget deficit by at least R20 billion next year for this to happen.

Voronin, Konarev, Zaykov Discuss Railroad Problems

PM0410142189 Moscow TRUD in Russian 4 Oct 89 p 1

[V. Karpov report under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session": "Emergency Situation"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] For 2 days in succession deputies have discussed the questions of the functioning of rail transport, which, moreover, have been exceptionally exacerbated by strikes and interethnic conflicts.

The picture presented to Supreme Soviet members by L. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was quite simply depressing. In July-August R1 billion worth of foodstuffs had not been supplied—they were either not delivered or were not unloaded in time. The situation did not improve in September. Some 300,000 tonnes of foodstuffs and 330,000 tonnes of industrial goods did not reach the store shelves. On the threshold of winter coal has not been delivered as stipulated by the plans, and many metallurgical production facilities have been placed in jeopardy. [passage omitted]

"Unloading rates," N. Konarev, USSR minister of railways, said, "have fallen in comparison with last year. This has never happened before—there had always been growth."

[Unidentified questioner] What are your proposals?

"To unload cars around the clock and on days off. And to sharply step up the responsibility of all participants in the transport sector."

This is a well-known problem. By 4 or 5 in the afternoon store warehouses and wholesale bases close and the loading workers go home....

"Last Friday we held a special session on the questions of the unloading of railcars," L. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow City Party Committee, said in the recess between session sittings. "We outlined specific measures."

We were told at the Ministry of Railways that over the past 3 days the number of cars of vegetables and potatoes in the capital that had not been unloaded fell by half. Clearly, the problem will be solved where people treat the unloading and supply of goods to the population with full responsibility. It was no surprise that the draft resolution proposed by the government at the USSR Supreme Soviet session on urgent measures to ensure the uninterrupted functioning of rail transport and base sectors of the national economy drew the attention of union republic councils of ministers and local soviet executive committees to the need to take urgent measures to improve organization and discipline in transportation.

What should be changed in the draft resolution? There was a fierce discussion on this question. Initially it was a question of draft emergency measures, but later, bearing in mind the fact that we as yet have no legislation on this subject, a calmer formula was adopted: "Immediate measures." A number of deputies thought that the government should bestow special powers. Others proposed striving for the strict fulfillment of existing laws. [passage omitted]

The session also discussed the need for clear cooperation among participants in the transport sector. It can hardly be permissible that consignees, transportation workers, and freight customers are currently isolated from each other by a reliable barrier of fines and reciprocal sanctions. TRUD has drawn attention to this in recent articles. I put this question to L. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Voronin] Yes, I read the TRUD articles on this. The problem is undoubtedly important. In order to investigate it and find a way out of this situation I have instructed that specific proposals be worked out.

[Karpov] What would you like?

[Voronin] To make everyone interested in end results....

At yesterday's morning sessions the deputies could not arrive at a unanimous opinion. The discussion was carried over into the evening. The parliamentarians' carping is understandable. They want to adopt a resolution which will work straightaway.

A corresponding resolution was adopted at the evening session.

Political & Social

Further Reportage on Nagorno-Karabakh Blockade

Interior Ministry Troops To Increase

LD0310180989 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—The number of Soviet interior ministry troops will be markedly increased after mass unrest in Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Abkhaziya and other volatile Soviet regions demonstrated that their numerical strength is insufficient, the force's political chief told the newspaper IZVESTIYA today.

Major-General A. Griyenko disclosed that their number today stands at 36,000, but half are tied down by local duties and cannot be airlifted elsewhere in emergencies.

"The substantial increase in mobile units is a forced measure, prompted by today's needs to ensure public order," he said.

"The increase, which is to take two years, will be effected by conscripting draftees for regular military service. No troop transfers from the Soviet Army to the Interior Ministry's force are planned," General Griyenko added.

He called for a law on Interior Ministry troops, which will clearly define their rights, duties and spheres of responsibility.

Subcommission Head on Railroad Crisis

PM0310151189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with V. Kolesnikov, chairman of the railroad transport subcommission of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions, by own correspondent V. Romanyuk under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Establishing Order in Transport"—date and place of interview not given]

[Text] The situation in the sphere of railroad transport remains complex. Every day the editorial office is receiving reports about disruptions in the delivery of freight, about stations chockablock with railroad cars, about outright sabotage in the sphere of transport. The IZVESTIYA correspondent in Yerevan, for instance, has just sent in the following report: Not a single train has gone through to Armenia on the Azerbaijan railroad during the past Saturday and Sunday, the situation is critical...

In connection with the situation which has taken shape on the railroads, our correspondent met with V. Kolesnikov, chairman of the subcommission for railroad transport of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions. This is what he was told:

[Kolesnikov] I have just received the latest information from the Ministry of Railways. In September Armenia failed to take delivery of more than 30,000 railroad cars, that is 1.6 million tonnes of freight. The Azerbaijan Railroad ignores all instructions issued by the Ministry of Railways.

I must say that the situation in the sphere of transport is also deteriorating in other parts of the country. And for the same reason—interethnic strife. The passage of trains between the Moldavian and Odessa railroads has been disrupted for 17 days. Odessa transport workers' attempts to get trains through to Tiraspol and Bendery have been thwarted.

Miners' strikes have introduced additional difficulties in the transport situation. Instances of the dismantling of the permanent way, damage to technical facilities, and subjection of rolling stock to fire have become more frequent. The situation has deteriorated to such an extent that in certain republics people are demanding that the national language be introduced in transport, which is impermissible in general, apart from being simply dangerous. As is known, West European countries have agreed to introduce a single language, English, in the transport sphere. Do we, in the Union, need something else to argue about?

[Romanyuk] What is the solution?

[Kolesnikov] I believe that the USSR Supreme Soviet must as a matter of urgency introduce emergency measures in the sphere of railroad transport. Strikes in this sphere must be outlawed and economic sanctions applied to the culprits, who should be required to fully reimburse the damage caused to enterprises, organizations, and individual citizens. The strike participants must be made to feel that every new hour of sabotage destroys the well-being of their families.

[Romanyuk] The session's agenda includes the examination of the draft law on labor conflicts. Perhaps the question of strikes in the transport sphere should be resolved within the framework of this law, by declaring them illegal, for instance?

[Kolesnikov] I am convinced that this is what should be done. However, the debate on the draft could go on for a long time, while order in the sphere of transport must be established without delay. The cold weather is upon us. Therefore, I believe, it is necessary, as a matter of urgency, to adopt new railroad legislation. This opinion is shared by other USSR people's deputies and railroad workers.

We believe that it is important to place the railroads on a special footing in respect of other national economic sectors. In a critical situation such as the current one, the USSR Supreme Soviet has the right to declare a state of emergency in a region where transport has been paralyzed and to introduce armed protection for engine drivers and train crews. In such situations the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet must be invested with emergency powers. Incidentally, the U.S. president is vested with such powers and 2 years ago they were also bestowed on the prime minister of Great Britain.

[Romanyuk] Do you believe that such emergency measures are really necessary?

[Kolesnikov] Transport is the circulation system of the national economic organism. It is like oxygen. If you cut off the supply, it is the end. No matter what problems may arise, transport must work like clockwork. Incidentally, more attention should be paid to this sector. We carry more than half the world's freight turnover by rail, yet the means allocated for the development of this type of transport do not increase. Nor does railroad transport rank among the 10 priority programs.

Situation in Armenia, Azerbaijan Viewed

LD0410100889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 2 October broadcasts a 12-minute "USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs reports" program with correspondent V. Bakarinov. The program considers the situations in Armenia and Azerbaijan. Bakarinov presents USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs, V.P. Trushin, who has just returned from a trip to Azerbaijan. Trushin describes the situation in NKAO as very serious and gives various examples of interethnic strife.

USSR Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Yu. D. Zhurkin then describes the situation in Armenia, where he visited recently, speaking about the railroad blocade which is being stepped up and its consequences. Zhurkin says: "After the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU platform was criticized at a rally in Yerevan's Theatre Square, as one unable to solve the urgent problems of the country's peoples and its was said that our republic, as other republics, remains virtually without rights—as a colony. Unfortunately, at such rallies, which attract thousands of people, one does not hear anything about interethnic issues. But at the 24 September rally they went so far as to call the Central Committee the republic's most harmful body. Communists and Komsomol members are called upon to return their membership cards, and this actually takes place quite often".

Trushin adds that hundreds of thousands of people from both republics have been involved in the conflict. "Since February 1988, 117 people have died, 3,145 people were injured, more than 2,000 houses and flats were burned down and ransacked, and 327,000 of Armenians and

Azerbaijani have become refugees in Armenia and Azerbaijan." The blocade of roads and railways is a very aggravating factor, and was initiated by the People's Front of Azerbaijan, he says. The damages from the blocade already amount to more than R1,000 million. Refugees from both sides display depressingly aggressive attitudes and do not want to seek a compromise. The leaders of the Karabakh Movement in Armenia—(Ashot Manchuryan, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, Khasik Stampoltsyan) and others, who are to blame for whipping up passions, have become deputies of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet and they are striving to seize leading posts in the republic. (Abufaz Aliyev, Ikhtibar Mamedov, Nadzhaf Nadzhafov) and other leaders of the People's Front in Azerbaijan are using the same tactics in their republic.

Trushin concludes the conversation by saying that urgent political actions are required to resolve the stalemate.

Alarm Voiced at Rail Traffic Disruption

PM0310135189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Mikhail Berger article under the rubric "On Topics of the Day": "'War on Rails.' Against Whom and for the Sake of What?"]

[Text] I am disconcerted by the report disseminated among USSR people's deputies by the Ministry of Railways. They are no longer just hitches on the railroad. They are actual combat operations. Explosions on the railroad track, dismantling of the rails, acts of arson, firing upon trains... This occurs in the Transcaucasus. In Nagorno-Karabakh a railroad bridge over the Kurkur-Chey River was blown up before a train passed over it. In Abkhazia a militarized guard on tunnels, bridges, and special freight was disarmed.

Against this background the picketing of spur tracks in Klaypeda port seems almost a childish prank, and the cessation of traffic between the Moldavian and Odessa Railroads for more than 2 weeks seems an "ordinary" unpleasantness. Although in the first case 24 tanker trains with fuel oil for export were held up, and in the second 60,000 cars did not arrive at their destination.

It would hardly be fair to assume that the Klaypeda pickets set themselves the aim of reducing the influx of currency into the country and that the strikers in Tiraspol and Bendery intended to leave thousands of consumers in the republic without raw materials and semimanufactures. Behind each such instance there lay conditions, demands, and ultimatums unconnected, as a rule, with the specific dispatchers and recipients of freight. Even when the desire to infringe the interests of those to whom the freight is addressed seems obvious, we are dealing, above all, with an attempt to resolve certain individual economic or political problems by means of economic pressure and sometimes even blackmail.

We will not now go into the essence of the demands themselves or assess their level of fairness, if I may put it like this. We will speak of the methods.

In its report the Ministry of Railways names these with official impartiality: "deliberate violations of uninterrupted train traffic and loading and unloading operations" which created an extraordinary situation in transport and complicated the work of the country's entire national economy.

A new line in reports by the State Committee for Statistics recently had its "premiere"—losses of worktime resulting from strikes. And in the very first report there is a huge figure for losses during the first half of this year—2 million man-days. And that does not include the July peak of the miners' strikes, as a result of which more than 7 million tonnes of coal was not dispatched in July—which is still affecting the distribution of the freight car pool.

So, strikes are one of the chief causes of the "deliberate violations." As V. Sluzhakov, an employee of the newspaper GUDOK, tells IZVESTIYA, strikes accounted for the lion's share of the R0.5-billion direct losses in transport operations alone. This sum would be quite sufficient to introduce the benefits for railroad workers which the Ministry of Railways and the trade union Central Committee promised after the threat of a transport workers' strike emerged.

Of course, it is not a question only of losses by railroad workers. There is a real danger of being left without heat in the winter, and it is not hard to guess what this threatens in our climate. There is the threat to worsen the overall state of the country's economy, which is already giving rise to great concern. Many enterprises in Armenia are now without raw materials. Apart from raw materials, necessities have not been reaching the republic since 4 September because of the blockade on the railroad.

Of course, masses of problems, including those mentioned in this case, arise out of the undeveloped nature of economic relations. If the railroads and their branches were interconnected not only by administrative bonds but by contracts seriously affecting the working people's personal material interests, there would be fewer "deliberate violations of uninterrupted working" and "temporary refusals to work."

Touching inter alia on the problems of cars standing idle for various reasons, L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, expressed this view at a recent meeting with journalists. If trains carrying food, vegetables, and other goods are left still loaded in Moscow, Leningrad, or any other point and the local management organs are unable to organize their unloading, it is necessary to take funds from such recipients and send the cars to other addresses.

The "heroes of the festivities" probably include those who believe: The worse things are, the better. And there are probably those who cannot be filled with alarm at the country's fate. But there are certain values common to all mankind. The surgeon has no right to throw down his scalpel at the operating table. You cannot conceive of firemen abandoning their work for the purpose of getting something from people who have lost everything in a fire or from their relatives. Even cynical egotism has, must have, its limits. But if not? The railroad workers have already been forced to propose the introduction of a special situation on the Transcaucasus railroads. Tomorrow (God grant that I am wrong) the situation in other parts of the country could require something similar.

What is happening cannot be called the costs of democracy. It is payment with democracy itself. And, perhaps, we ourselves will not notice how we squander it all on economic blackmail and declare war on ourselves, and we will end up in a special situation.

'Immediate Measures' Called for

PM0310144189 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 21 Sep 89 p 1

[ARMENIAN PRESS AGENCY own correspondent A. Grigoryan report: "NKAO: No Time To Waste"]

[Text] Stepanakert—The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has probably never before, all through the years of Soviet power, lived through conditions more complex than those prevailing in these uneasy September days. The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], which until quite recently was calling on people in Artsakh [Armenian name for NKAO] to end the strike and restore the labor rhythm, has in reality created a situation around the NKAO making it impossible to work normally. Furthermore, the blockade of the region has resulted in a sharp deterioration in food supplies for the oblast's Armenian population. It must be said that the neighboring republic has a very strange way of showing its concern for the prosperity of Nagorno-Karabakh and the stabilization of the explosive situation in the region.

The state of the economy in the autonomous entity is deteriorating not by the day but by the hour. Raw materials, without which many industrial enterprises cannot function, are running out. Finished products worth R1 million are stockpiled in the electrical engineering plant's warehouses. Some 100,000 pairs of footwear produced by the local factory are vainly awaiting shipment to clients at 40 destinations in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Ukraine, Central Asia, the North Caucasus, and elsewhere in the country. Diesel-fueled machines are being used to bring in the grape harvest, but fuel supplies are also running out. A motor convoy on its way to pick up gasoline was detained outside the oblast yesterday. The situation is no better as regards food supplies. You don't have to be a genius to guess that Azerbaijan is resorting to strong-arm pressure, utilizing its more advantageous geographical location to attain its goal vis-a-vis the Karabakh problem. So what has happened to the familiar slogans about respect for the law which the Azerbaijan SSR press has repeatedly addressed to its neighbors?

The NKAO Special Administration Committee, the Special District Military Commander's Office, and the oblast's party, soviet, trade union, and Communist Youth League organs are living through difficult times. The situation is being aggravated by incessant provocative actions by those eager to exacerbate the tension. It has already been reported that a rampaging crowd in Agdamskiy Rayon stopped and overturned a vehicle belonging to a USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Investigation Group. Senior Lieutenant Andrey Tyugayev, a citizen of Russian nationality, and Lieutenant Sergey Gaba, a Moldavian, died as a result of the beating and injuries they suffered. Three other militia staffers suffered bodily harm. On the other hand, a KaMAZ truck carrying construction materials and driven by an Azerbaijani driver had its window smashed in Stepanakert.

The efforts by the Special Administration Committee to normalize the situation in the region have still not produced the desired results. This is further convincing proof that events might get out of hand unless immediate measures are taken to solve the Karabakh problem.

Yerevan Official on Military Exercise, Blockade

NC0210135589 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2000 GMT 29 Sep 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Recently the republican press reported that the troops of the Transcaucasian military okrug will hold military exercises in Armenia. This has created inordinate concern in the republic. Major General Surkov, chief of the political department of the Yerevan garrison, said that the exercises are entirely related to the military preparedness of the troops and are training exercises. In addition to that, these exercises were designed to be held when NATO countries are conducting large-scale military exercises from Norway to Turkey. However, taking into consideration the prevailing situation in the region, the okrug leadership decided to reduce the size of the military exercises; it was also decided to confine them to the training sites.

Regarding the blockade, Surkov added that in his capacity as deputy, he has expressed his views to [Chairman of the Council of Ministers] Ryzhkov and [First Deputy Chairman of the Presidium] Lukyanov. I have written to them that the blockade is a political provocation and an inhumane act. Drawing on my mandate, I have demanded that the blockade be immediately ended and the culprits be brought strictly to account.

Further on Winter Plans for Armenian Quake Zone

PM0310100789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[ARMENPRESS-TASS report: "Attention to Preparations for Winter"]

[Text] V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Emergencies, who is in Armenia, has held a conference to discuss the progress of preparations for the 1989-1990 fall-winter period in the parts of the republic that were hit by the earthquake.

The conference was attended by leading officials from the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers, representatives of the USSR ministries and departments which helped to deal with the consequences of the disaster, leaders of construction and planning organizations, and representatives from city and rayon soviets in the disaster zone.

The conference participants were particularly concerned about the question of housing people left homeless. In order to urgently resolve this matter it is planned to accelerate the supply of prefabricated housing and to increase the pace of construction of heat supply networks and other utilities. It was noted that the pace of work is being hampered by the poor increase in the production of local construction materials and cement. Because of this they will have to be imported from other regions, which will increase the already great pressure on rail transport and the cost of the work. In this connection the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers was instructed to implement specific measures to resolve the problem of supplying construction sites with local construction materials.

The conference also examined the question of the work of rail transport. Violations of its activity on Azerbaijani territory recently have caused serious interruptions to construction and to housing and municipal services' preparations for the winter. A further failure to take measures to ensure normal rail traffic would lead to the undermining of the preparations for work under winter conditions being made by enterprises and housing and municipal services in the parts of Armenia hit by the earthquake.

In order to provide people with housing, schools, and hospitals as quickly as possible it has been decided to increase the pace of work in the earthquake zone even in winter. The conference participants examined in detail the program of measures for preparations for this complex period. These include restoring and building roads in areas of new construction, the timely creation of reserves of materials and fuel, the preparation of equipment and hardware, and other tasks.

Specific decisions were made on all issues.

Deputy Editor Views Yeltsin U.S. Visit Coverage

PM0210142089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 39, 24 Sep 89 p 3

[Deputy Chief Editor Vitaliy Tretyakov "My View" article: "About Yeltsin's Visit to the USA"]

[Text] Now we are at it, at last. New touches have been added to Boris Yeltsin's political profile following his trip [to] the USA. PRAVDA has lended its pages for a reprint from the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA an article by Vittorio Zucconi who reports with amazing accuracy how much Yeltsin drank during his unoffical visit, what from and whom with. Indeed, glasnost has made a dashing stride forward—only yesterday Soviet readers did not know such details about their political leaders of either low or higher rank than Yeltsin. One should presume, of course, that many of them happen to raise a glass or two when abroad—at any rate, during official receptions. Except those who don't drink, of course. But we don't yet know who among our politicians are abstainers. Just as we don't know in which stores they shop while abroad. Now we know about Yeltsin.

Glasnost, as many tend to believe, has no boundaries.

There must be a time when it has to bypass even this one. The breach of the boundary occurred right at the moment when a people's deputy of the USSR and chairman of one of the USSR Supreme Soviet's committees found himself in the USA. Shortly before the autumn session of the Supreme Soviet many people's deputies happened to travel abroad, but not all of them were honoured with such attention as Yeltsin was.

It is a pity, of course, that the aforementioned breakthrough in this aspect of glasnost was effected not by the Soviet press, but by an Italian newspaper. Evidently, the Soviet correspondents in the USA were on vacation at that moment. On the other hand, it is clear: Even before September this year Western journalists had been telling readers not only about the official part of Soviet politicians' visits abroad. They have more experience in this. True, for some reason we never took advantage of this experience in the past. And there is a lot in it that one can learn. How, for example, is it possible to learn how much and what, Yeltsin drank in one night while all alone in his hotel room in Baltimore? Obviously, only in two ways: Either by peeping through the keyhole or by checking the wastepaper basket in the morning when the people's deputy had left the room.

But all kidding aside, it is hard to take the article from LA REPUBBLICA as anything other than a bad anecdote. But it has been reprinted. And Pravda editors, having announced that the article was being published without any cuts, didn't bother to print even one line informing the reader whether the author of the article is trustworthy or whether he was trying to get us to see Yeltsin's visit as he (the journalist) wanted us to see it. But the ten million readers of our first newspaper will hardly accept such rules of the game. Nor will they be accepted by the millions of electors who voted for Boris Yeltsin. Nor do I accept them as a reader, elector and journalist who fully understands that glasnost doesn't consist of tailoured facts and prejudice.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR has started and will continue to discuss the status of a people's deputy. Until now no question has arisen as to whether or not there is any need to fence deputies in to protect them from being written about in other countries. But most likely questions will arise now.

Glasnost, which airs someone else's linen, has long been a tried and tested means of suppressing genuine glasnost. Personally, I am not at all concerned over what Yeltsin drank or bought while across the ocean. We regard him as a political figure, not as a character for the "Don't Pass By" stand in import make. And it's important to know how deputy Yeltsin represented our country, what he spoke about in the USSR. There is more than enough material for this: lectures, seven interviews during one day alone a 15-minute talk with the US President, and so on, and so forth. The Soviet press featured only a few short items. The excerpts from quoted phrases did not produce a favourable impression. I believe that A. Shalnev of IZVESTIYA made one apt remark when he concluded his commentary on Yeltsin's trip with the following: "...In this connection I have one personal remark to make: I once happened to interview former US President Jimmy Carter in Moscow. Among other things, I asked him about his attitude towards Washington's Strategic Defense Initiative, knowing in advance that Carter was opposed to this system. But I wanted to hear this firsthand, so to speak. I didn't. The ex-President looked at me and said: I didn't come to Moscow to criticize my government. I'll do that in the United States...."

In short, there is food for thought. And we shouldn't deny ourselves the possibility of returning to this theme once again. In fact, one would like to believe that Boris Yeltsin himself will want to reply to all the questions that have arisen in connection with his recent trip.

Miners Hold 2-Hour Strike in Ukraine

AU0310161289 Paris AFP in English 1540 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 3 (AFP)—Miners from 21 pits in the Lvov-Volinsk coalfield of the western Ukraine held a two-hour work stoppage Tuesday to protest the failure by authorities to honour commitments made during last July's nationwide strike, a human rights spokesman said.

The miners said economic promises had not been kept and they also expressed a lack of confidence in local trade union bodies, the spokesman for the unofficial Ukrainian Helskinki Watch Committee told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE.

News of the strike action came as the Soviet parliament was discussing a Kremlin proposal to outlaw strikes for a 15-month period.

Meanwhile in Lvov, a number of firms also held a two-hour strike Tuesday, this time to protest the violence used by Interior Ministry troops to break up a demonstration in town on Sunday [1 October], the spokesman added.

Dozens of demonstrators were reportedly injured by truncheon-wielding special troops who carried shields to protect themselves, the spokesman said.

The demonstration itself had been called to demand the release of several people earlier arrested by police for displaying the banned blue and yellow Ukrainian flag.

A strike committee, set up Monday in Lvov, called Tuesday's stoppage, the Helskinki group spokesman said.

Ukrainian Uniate Catholics had held a mass demonstration last month in Lvov to press for the recognition of their church, banned by Stalin in 1946.

Leadership Criticized at Moldavian Party Plenum

PM0410100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Own correspondent A. Pasechnik dispatch: "The Most Acute Shortage. Notes from the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Kishinev—I must confess that I carried out a small survey that Saturday during the 9 hours which I spent at the plenum. What words recurred most frequently in speeches from the rostrum? It became obvious long before the session ended: "A shortage of trust."

Of all the shortages which are currently plaguing our existence this is the most acute, and it is straining the nerves of our agitated society. Moldavia is by no means an exception in this respect. Rather the reverse. Discussing the sociopolitical situation in the republic and the problems in interethnic relations, the plenum participants were practically unanimous that it was precisely the masses' shortage of trust in the party headquarters and the leadership of the republic which had a negative impact on the turbulent events of the past few months.

Not so long ago our paper reported these events in detail. Let me recall that the discussion and adoption of the draft laws on languages became a kind of Rubicon which divided the republic into two opposed camps. The Moldavian language was elevated to the rank of state language in the republic and together with Russian became the means of inter-nation communication here. This compromise solution did not please everyone, however. Political strikes have only just ended in Tiraspol, Bendery, and Rybnitsa, strikes in which one of the main demands was that state language status be bestowed also on Russian. The intransigence, the confrontation which we have witnessed cannot be explained by purely linguistic concerns. The root causes lie deeper, of course. They are based, among other things, on the unquestionable decline of the language and culture of the representatives of the indigenous nationality.

All this was reported, I repeat, by PRAVDA and other central newspapers in quite some detail. And now the strikes which hit the economy of the republic hard have just ended. Passions have subsided at rallies of the Moldavian People's Front, the "Yedinstvo" [Unity] international movement, and the "Gagauz Khalky" association which represent the main informal organizations operating here. What is this? A brief respite? Or is it dawning on people that emotions are not the best propellant for the ship of perestroyka and that slogans are cannot replace sails?

However that may be, the plenum participants had a, by today's standards, rare opportunity to catch their breath, as the saying goes, to take stock, and to reflect. And it must be said that they made full use of this opportunity. It began with the report delivered by S. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee. Two key questions were of decisive importance. What is the origin of the aforementioned shortage of trust, and what is the way or ways out of the prevailing complex situations?

The Central Committee Bureau is rightly being criticized for the slow progress of perestroyka and for lagging in the appraisal of the shortcomings which beset Moldavian Communists and in the elaboration of ways to eliminate these shortcomings, the main speaker said. Many questions are discussed and tackled only after they have been raised by informal organizations in a manner which brooks no delay.

This is correct. Although it is not the whole story. It is not just the delays in making appraisals and in taking action, but sometimes also the complete absence of such appraisals and actions which have become the Achilles heel of the republic party headquarters, as it were. The exacerbation of interethnic relations has assumed a threatening character, the polarization of people along ethnic lines even within labor collectives and families has intensified, and manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism in everyday life have become more frequent. Even at party meetings, one of the speakers at the plenum related with alarm, Communists take up their seats in different parts of the hall—Moldavians on one side, everyone else on the other. Where is it all going to end?! And in this sort of situation the Central Committee thought it preferable for a long time "staunchly" not to declare its stance, to maintain silence, O. Yarandina, solderer at the Bendery "Elektroapparatura" plant, and P. Dubalar and I. Russu, rayon party committee first secretaries from Kamenka and Slobodzeya, stated at the plenum.

As a result, Ye. Berdnikov, first secretary of the Rybnitsa city party committee, declared, that same shortage of trust in the republic party headquarters continued to build up and the majority of the city's primary party organizations rated the work of the Central Committee as unsatisfactory because of the gulf which separated it from the interests of labor collectives and because of its disregard for the realities of the day.

Turning a blind eye to these realities, pretending that nothing out of the ordinary is happening is a chronic ailment of which we have to rid ourselves in the most decisive manner. At the time, people in Kishinev clearly underestimated the nature and force of the spontaneous formations which were springing up, they were unable to separate the wheat from the chaff, as the saying goes, and to lead people from the front. For a long time, a tortuously long time, the Central Committee did not dare to engage in an open, frank discussion at the rallies and meetings which were rocking the whole republic. And when it finally did decide to join in, it found that it had missed the boat. Even now certain republic leaders find it very hard to switch their registers from patronizing monologues to dialogue.

The republic party headquarters again seems totally incapable of engaging in a direct, broad discussion with the authors of the initiative for Dnestr region autonomy. Yet the situation is alarming, not to say dangerous. More than 2 weeks ago soviet executive committee [ispolkom] sessions in Bendery, Tiraspol, and Rybnitsa suspended the operation of the laws on languages, which had been passed by the latest session of the republic Supreme Soviet, on the territory under their jurisdiction. The same sessions had discussed the idea of the autonomy of the said rayons, which are inhabited mainly by non-Moldavians. S. Grossu criticized this idea in his report. Is that all that is going to be done?.. Or will the matter again be reduced to appeals via the republic press? Quite justifiably, the aforementioned I. Russu demanded from the plenum rostrum that the widest possible circle of "interested parties"—initiators of autonomization, republic and rayon leaders, scientists, and specialists—be gathered with a view to discussing this pressing problem.

Incidentally, the appeals deserve a special mention. This method of influencing people's minds requires above all a sense of proportion. It is very popular with people in Kishinev. Numerous appeals were issued to the strikers, for instance, urging them to resume work. Without particular success, however. The strikers returned to their workplaces when they themselves saw fit. Why did the appeals from the capital fall on deaf ears? It would be desirable for Central Committee departments to work out the answer to this question, and work it out in cooperation with the strikers rather than on their own, and then report the outcome to the plenum. One of the appeals, for instance, was discussed in such detail at a recent Central Committee bureau session that it took 3 days to publish it. Strikers in Tiraspol asked me: "What did they say in Kishinev about us? Did you near anything?..." Meanwhile the strike situation was changing not from day to day but from hour to hour! Outstripped by events again...

Out of habit we keep hoping that specific documents "will do the trick" of their own accord, automatically as it were, one of the speakers noted aptly, yet it is people, not papers, who get things done. And to corroborate this statement he cited the complete fiasco of the decisions of the Central Committee May Plenum. It had been a stormy plenum. The sociopolitical atmosphere in the republic and ways of improving it were keenly discussed. An entire program was elaborated. Yet the situation deteriorated even further and the republic was swamped with a wave of demonstrations, rallies, and disturbances. Why? Was it not because, as L. Tsurkan, first secretary of the Tiraspol party city committee noted, because we very often fail to implement our own decisions, even the most important decisions, casting our words to the winds and thus spreading the germ of distrust in leaders?

At this plenum too, they did not even return to their own past decisions, they did not discuss where they had not succeeded in the current priority sphere of the Central Committee's work, and why. It was probably for this reason that L. Zagrudnaya, chairman of the Drokiyevskiy rayon soviet ispolkom, called on Central Committee members to master the theory and practice of situation analysis which is so badly needed at the moment, and to take fuller account of the ways of implementing adopted decisions and of the potential consequences of these decisions.

"Moreover, these decisions must not be short-sighted, they must not be dictated by strong-arm pressure on the Central Committee from the 'right' or the 'left,'" B. Palariya, first secretary of the Dubossarskiy rayon party committee said. "It is necessary to elaborate a precise outline plan for party work in the republic that would be in line with present-day demands."

This proposal is reflected in the resolution which was adopted by the plenum. The Central Committee bureau has been instructed to prepare, within the framework of the Program and Statutes of the CPSU (with the participation of members of Central Committee commissions, the aktiv, and the public), a political platform which will reflect the specific and national needs and conditions of the republic Communists' activity, and to submit it as the basis for party discussion at the upcoming 17th Congress of the Moldavian Communist Party which is to be convened in September of next year.

I must mention another feature of the plenum proceedings. Without exaggeration, during all my time in Moldavia I have never witnessed in that hall such sharp, categorical appraisals, such uncompromising attitudes, such a fierce clash of opinions. Members of the Central Committee bureau were personally subjected to sharp criticism for their passiveness and temporizing, other leaders were criticized for unscrupulousness and flirting with informal organizations, and yet others for adhering to stereotypes.... Much justified criticism was also leveled at the Central Committee first secretary who had at times lost hold of the reins and sidestepped active political struggle during certain critical moments. Well, the present conditions are forcing our top echelons to forget about their past political comfort.

In short, everything was as it should be now. True, there is one "but" which was noted by V. Iovv, first secretary of the Beltsy party city committee:

"Many people voicing criticism here are trying to blame the Central Committee first secretary alone for all the disruptions and omissions. Is this perhaps fair, is it done in party fashion? What sort of comrades-in-arms are colleagues in the bureau who look on silently from the sidelines at how the first secretary is struggling in difficult situations? No, the bureau and the entire Central Committee must admit that the blame for the prevailing situation rests on us all."

This remark is very apt and, allow me to add, it does not apply just to the situation in Moldavia.

The resolution which was adopted at the plenum was discussed for an unusually long time. It is a businesslike resolution, which defines the republic Communists' range of tasks in the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee platform on the nationalities policy and provides a basis for the consolidation of all healthy forces in the struggle for perestroyka and the harmonization of interethnic relations. The main thing is to ensure that the plans do not remain just on paper.

...During their registration, plenum participants were given an interesting collection of materials on problems pertaining to interethnic relations which had been compiled by the Central Committee Ideological Department in cooperation with social scientists. It includes articles, studies, results of sociological polls, reviews of letters, and so forth. For instance, how do people appraise the expected changes in interethnic relations? I see from one of the tables that up to 50 percent of those polled believe that these relations will improve in the near future. Does this mean that the credit of trust has not yet been exhausted?

Ukrainians Demonstrate Against 'Police Brutality'

AU0310211189 Paris AFP in English 2050 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow Oct 3 (AFP)—Nearly 30,000 people massed Tuesday evening in Lvov, western Ukraine, and urged the republic's new party leader publicly to condemn police brutality Sunday against Ukrainian nationalists.

Anatoli Dotsenko, a member of the human rights group Helsinki Ukraine, said the public prosecutor of Lvov had addressed the crowd to denounce the police action and had promised an official enquiry.

Mr. Dotsenko said the "great majority" of commercial firms and offices in Lvov had been paralysed by a two-hour strike organised Tuesday in protest at Sunday's [1 October] incidents.

About 10 demonstrators were said to have been injured Sunday when riot police brutally dispersed a column of marchers.

Tuesday's mass meeting was organised by the "Rukh" or popular Ukraine Movement for Perestroika (reform) founded last month. Permission for the meeting was received barely an hour before it was due to take place.

A Rukh speaker told the crowd that Rukh would hold its own "independent" inquiry into the police action and would announce its conclusions at a meeting on October 15.

On that day, the Rukh will be holding rallies in all main Ukrainian towns as part of a campaign for new and more democratic electoral rules for local elections.

Last week Vladimir Ivashko replaced the conservative Vladimir Shcherbitskiy as leader of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

Lvov has turned into a hotbed of Ukrainian nationalism since nationalists and members of the Uniate Catholic Church held a big demonstration there last month to demand the church's official recognition.

The Ukrainian Catholics were forcibly integrated into the Russian Orthodox Church by the synod of Lvov in 1946 under Stalin.

Comparison of Gorbachev Ukrainian Plenum Speech

PM0110114989

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 29 September 1989 publishes in its Second Edition on pages 1 and 2 an unattributed account of M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the 28 September Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum in Kiev. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "Perestroyka—The Party—Socialism," with the translation of the Moscow Radio version, which was published on pages 42-52 of the 29 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Gorbachev Speaks at 28 Sep Ukrainian Plenum," reveals the following variations:

Page 46, column one, paragraph one, second full sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...my certainty that Ukrainian Communists and..." (omitting "shoulder to shoulder with");

Paragraph four, first sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...forward in comprehending the dialectics of"... (omitting "—it's a difficult matter, but a necessary, and essential one—");

Same paragraph, third sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...not just communists. Various, often diametrically..." (omitting sentence)

Same paragraph, penultimate sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...and the Congress, can only be of..." (providing alternate translation)

Page 46, column two, paragraph two, second sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...them, no one is passing the buck. But, while giving this assessment, we do not have the right—it would be a distortion of a different kind, and no less serious—to cancel all these decades..." (providing alternate translation);

Same paragraph, penultimate sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...and headed perestroyka.

In this way..." (omitting last sentence, picking up paragraph three);

Paragraph three, second sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...across these barriers. But we have..." (omitting phrase);

Same paragraph, sentence five in PRAVDA reads: "...it found itself. Many probably feel..." (omitting two sentences);

Paragraph four, first sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...destiny of perestroyka. There can be..." (omitting "...and the interests of the people.");

Page 47, column one, paragraph three, first sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...of work can realistically influence the course of..." (providing alternate translation);

Same paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...The real revolutionary must be able to act in a revolutionary way in the most complex conditions.

In speaking about..." (omitting words, picking up fourth paragraph);

Paragraph four, eighth sentence in PRAVDA reads: "own vanguard role. There are attempts..." (omitting sentence);

Page 47, column two, third paragraph, first sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...I would like also to stress as a key issue of party building the fact that we are in..." (providing alternate translation);

Page 48, column two, paragraph three, second sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...Central Committee with workers and kolkhoz members who are members of the..." (providing alternate translation);

Paragraph five, first sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...be said that efforts to utterly confuse these issues are being made by those very forces who have launched a frontal attack against the party. The aim of..." (providing alternate translation);

Page 49, column one, paragraph six, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...the immediate future.

It is important to stress that in the course of this multifaceted work, which involves both practical experts and academics, it is a matter not of inventing the future but of studying how this future will develop out of our present activity.

Now, it is..." (adding paragraph);

Page 49, column two, first paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...of world culture; the power of the soviets as the power of..." (providing alternate translation);

Page 50, column one, paragraph one, third sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...idea are man as the supreme value..." (providing alternate translation);

Same paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...renewal of socialism, in the perestroyka process, is following the path of the all-around development of democracy..." (providing alternate translation);

Paragraph four, first sentence in PRAVDA begins: "The process of the renewal..." (substituting "process" for "question");

Page 50, column two, only paragraph, fifth sentence from the end in PRAVDA reads: "...the interaction of practice and theory that is ridding itself of dogmatic stereotypes. At the vanguard..." (providing alternate translation);

Same paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...I wish you success in all your work on perestroyka, on the solution of the people's vital problems, and on the renewal of our party and our society. (Applause)" (providing alternate translation).

Ligachev Calls for Party Unity

PM0210131589 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 10 Sep 89 p 1

[KIRTAG report: "Sticking Firmly to the Principles of Perestroyka"]

[Excerpts] On 9 September Ye K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited the Frunze branch of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum. [passage omitted]

Then Ye.K. Ligachev visited the house that contains a museum commemorating M.V. Frunze. [passage omitted]

In the elders' tearoom Ye.K. Ligachev had a meeting with party, war, and labor veterans. [passage omitted]

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the meeting.

I am glad you have spoken honestly and frankly of your anxieties and concerns, he said. This is evidence of Soviet people's great political activeness, of the fact that you are living a full life as a society. It is clear why all the events taking place in the country are so close to the hearts of the majority of our society. There is no simple way to describe them today. Perhaps it is the first time we have encountered such complex phenomena, which different people are evaluating in different ways. But we must not lose our sense of optimism, and I am sure that we will cope with the processes which at times develop not in an entirely favorable way.

You were frank, so I too will be absolutely frank. Perhaps not everyone will like some of my opinions, and I am not talking about the audience in this tearoom, but some of the people outside this hall, although does one have to please everyone? We Soviet people are molded by our socialist system, we have taken Marxist-Leninist philosophy on board, we are building a new society, and we are not going to restructure ourselves to suit a particular person's wishes and opinions.

Of course, difficult processes are taking place in our country today, perestroyka is an agonizing process, sometimes not how we originally imagined it would be, but I am convinced that we will surmount all the problems.

It is true that there are people who hold a different view. Many of them are engaged in destructive rather than creative work: they are doing nothing for the country, but merely prattle, revile everyone and everything, and even go so far as to slander the party and its leaders. Essentially, these people, if you look closely at the situation, are adopting anti-perestroyka positions.

Some people see perestroyka as having something to do with destruction, with the total negation of previous special processes. Yet it is a normal, logical phenomenon, which takes place in any society to one degree or another, especially in a socialist society. In fact we are following an untrodden path and, therefore, at all times, throughout the history of the Soviet state, we have been modifying, changing, restructuring something. In fact, one cannot progress without it.

Today some comrades have been talking about negative phenomena accompanying perestroyka, about some people expressing opinions that grate on the ear and seem odd to us. But the point is that we have much to overcome, the things we have inherited from past times, and it is no easy matter.

We are now discarding our rose-tinted spectacles and taking an unvarnished look at the past. I would not use the expression "stagnation era," but one must talk about the stagnation phenomena which got in our way and which have all to be overcome if we want to make sure progress. We all agree on the personality cult era, we reject everything that led to the misshaping of socialism. At the same time, can one forget the many positive things, and what Soviet people created during the years of socialist building through their indefatigable labor? This is something we are justly proud of, these achievements are something our friends abroad also take pride in and they, incidentally, are seriously concerned: Are we not departing from the basic principles of socialism? In fact, attacks on the party, on the Soviet social system, and on our heroic history have increased in frequency of late.

What can one say? We have lived our life, we have good memories, and I can proudly say, and I hope you will endorse this: We have been building socialism, you and I. And I would not accept anything else. I say this in all seriousness. Of course, the period of stagnation phenomena caused a lot of trouble. The economy and the social sphere were struggling, although cheerful slogans abounded. Irresponsibility was demoralizing society, such disgraceful phenomena as bribery and corruption had become widespread, and an immoral atmosphere had developed in some places. I was working in Siberia at the time and I did not know much, but I felt in my heart of hearts that all was not well. But I was living with the people, and I am proud of the fact that not one day was a burden to me. While in the centre some not very nice things were happening, and it is painful for us to talk about them today.

The scornful attitude of some leaders toward the party and the people has, of course, left its mark on people's consiousness, and when, on occasions, they say things we do not find very pleasant we must try to understand. But it is necessary to explain things to people, to every single person. So that they have a correct appreciation of the situation and judge people not by their words, at times demagogic, but by their specific actions.

But the fact that people today have different views, which they express openly, is a very good thing. Indeed we can still remember the time when the standard of criticms slumped in the party, when glasnost was absent, and the party was essentially heading in a very dangerous direction. Anyway, the party faces nasty consequences unless it critically appraises its own activity.

We were faced with a dilemma: Either we start perestroyka or we end up on the sidelines of history. Either we extricate ourselves from the condition of backwardness and attain leading positions in the world or we settle for the wretched role of raw-materials appendage for the highly developed countries.

I will give you an example. It is a disgrace, comrades, that the world does not buy our products. But the labor collective, the people, and the state are responsible for this. We cannot export solely raw materials, as tsarist Russia did; we have to learn how to make products that meet modern standards. One could cite many examples, to show the need for perestroyka. Therefore it is necessary to work vigorously in order to make up ground.

Perestroyka has been proceeding for 4 years. Some say that nothing has been achieved, but in my view we have made progress in all spheres. In the political plane the democratization of society is becoming an established feature and glasnost is developing. We now know what the people think and what they are talking about. In the course of meetings and the fierce debates that arise we get a clearer picture of the interests of individual groups and strata of the population and this gives a more acute sense of the public mood. Soviet power is developing and strengthening and local soviets have become more active. The main task now is to reinforce them with active, enterprising working people.

Perhaps we ought to implement the political reforms more rapidly, but haste is often deleterious to the cause. We have made many mistakes as it is, and we should always think about the consequences—this is true wisdom. Of course, one must not tarry and delay perestroyka processes, but one should adopt thorough and, I would say, optimal solutions and correct mistakes more efficiently and more swiftly.

A great deal has been done in the social sphere. Construction of housing and social and cultural facilities is taking place at an unprecedented pace. We have managed to boost consumer goods and food production. Unfortunately, many people, for some reason, have failed to notice this.

Further on Ye.K. Ligachev talked about the activation of Soviet foreign policy, about the fact that it has made it possible to achieve concrete results in the disarmament sphere. As a result some military expenditure will now become available to meet national economic needs, primarily the production of consumer goods and the manufacture of equipment for the light and food industry. He talked about the measures envisaged by the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government to improve the country's financial situation and bring down inflation.

Ye.K. Ligachev also dwelt on questions of the political situation in the country, stressing that at the moment one has the consolidation of healthy forces on a principled basis and, on the other hand, political division. At times these processes are very painful, therefore every Communist and every party organization must adopt a definite stance, actively struggle for our common cause, and be loyal to socialist ideals.

Preparations are being made at the moment for local soviet elections. But in a number of places the struggle is not for deputies' seats, but, essentially, for power. In some regions, by changing the composition of the soviets, they want to bring about decisions that can be geared to weakening socialism.

So we are all faced with the choice of what path to follow. It is impossible to stand on both sides of the fence today, although some leaders are still adopting this awkward stance.

We must go to the people, persuade them, explain our policy, and resolutely rebuff all those who are reviling everything created by the people's labor.

In such conditions, comrades, one must not retreat, one must struggle. It is not a situation where we can go off and have a well earned rest.

Party unity, ideological and organizational, should be strengthened, as should ties with the broad masses. I believe—and this is my firm opinion—that a member of the CPSU cannot take the part of those who are sowing interethnic discord, expressing separatist beliefs, and participating in strikes which cause great economic damage to the country.

We must strengthen the party ranks, without subjecting it to a purge, let alone to any repressive measures. I am against a clampdown, I must be frank about this, but there must be discipline and order in the party. It is necessary to use political means—that is the main thing. And if someone finds the CPSU Statutes and Program and party discipline a burden, let him step aside, he is not one of us.

Ye.K. Ligachev also covered some questions of party youth policy and talked of the need to strengthen the positions of the Communist Youth League [Komsomol] and enhance the role of Komsomol primary organizations.

In conclusion Ye.K. Ligachev wished the veterans courage, future success, and active, vigorous work.

Ye.K. Ligachev was accompanied on his visit to the museums and his meeting with the veterans by Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Bureau members T. Akmatov, A.M. Masaliyev, N.M. Chepelev, U.K. Chinaliyev, and M.Sh. Sherimkulov.

Sakharov Interviewed on Nationalities, Gorbachev

PM0310112489 Paris LE MONDE in French
30 Sep 89 pp 1,4

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Andrey Sakharov by Jacques Amalric and Michel Tatu in Paris—date not given]

[Text] [Interviewer] What do you think of the situation in your country as regards the struggles between different nationalities?

[Sakharov] I agree with the Baltic peoples: We must conclude a new federal pact to replace the 1922 pact. We must also abandon the system of having several kinds of entity: federal republics, autonomous republics, autonomous regions, and so forth. We must find a regional structure which rules out exploitation and inequalities.

But the most tragic situation is that of Nagorno-Karabakh. The problem began when that region was given to Azerbaijan under the terms of a cynical arrangement aimed at pandering to the political power of the Muslims, with Iran and Turkey in the vicinity. Immediately after the revolution, Moscow emphasized the Muslims, who were regarded as a springboard for extending the revolution toward the East. Ataturk's regime in Turkey was supported and the Muslims were favored at home. The word "Christian" was not spoken for decades. Gorbachev himself is pro-Azerbaijani.

At first, the problem could have been settled in the administrative and constitutional framework, on the basis of the right to self-determination. Transfer to Armenia was said to be contrary to the Constitution which makes provision for the inviolability of borders. But this principle in the Constitution is in fact subordinate to the principle of self-determination. Interior ministry troops should have been stationed there from the start, and that would have made it possible to make a calm decision.

But the opportunity was missed. Similarly, the system of special administration by Moscow for Nagorno-Karabakh—a reasonable measure—was instituted at the beginning of 1989, whereas it ought to have been established back in summer 1988. Since then, there have been pogroms and provocations against the Armenians. And temperatures were raised with the enormous meetings in Baku. The "people's front" which has just been formed in Azerbaijan is extremist.

There has been equal violence on both sides, but I do not think that it is a problem between two republics, it is a problem of self-determination for the Nagorno-Karabakh population. The rest is just political intrigue and provocations. The confrontation is now extremely dangerous. When I visited the region after the Armenian earthquake, I heard Azerbaijanis say: "Allah has punished them." There is now a blockade of Armenia, and transportation is being halted; the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh have even had their water cut off. There is also a special threat to the two Armenian enclaves situated in Azerbaijan, outside Nagorno-Karabakh—the village of Khamlakh and Shaumyanskiy Rayon. And the few remaining Armenians in Baku have had their houses burned down; they are even refused hospital treatment.

[Interviewer] What is your judgment of Mikhail Gorbachev?

[Sakharov] Before his election as president, I told the Congress that I saw no alternative to his leadership, but that we ought first to debate his program and that the position which he occupies ought to be allocated by direct elections. Since I was not heeded, I did not participate in the vote. The question of his role is complex. On the one hand, I understand that he is the initiator of perestroyka, and that that was a historical necessity. On the other hand, I see that he is behaving with great indecision, not only on the nationalities policy (at the latest plenum devoted to this subject this month, he aligned with the conservative right), but also with regard to the rest. The impression is that the real change was his arrival in the leadership. I am exaggerating a little, but this is the case. Is this temporary, is it a maneuver, or is it something permanent? I do not know.

What will he do now? His popularity has fallen considerably. Many people oppose him, but nobody can imagine anybody else in his place. My opinion of him has also deteriorated recently. As Yuriy Afanasyev said: "He must choose: He must either be the leader of perestroyka or the leader of the nomenklatura." If he chooses the first option, he will go up in my estimation.

If the right returns to power and if Gorbachev abandons perestroyka, the conservatives will not believe him and they will not forgive him for what he has done. He therefore cannot change course. But his hesitations are worrying.

At all events, for me the danger is not that Gorbachev might be ousted, but that he might follow a policy which means that we are indifferent to whether or not he is there. It is rather like the Kosygin syndrome: It was not important whether he was there or not, because his policy had nothing to do with the reforming ideas attributed to him.

[Interviewer] What picture of the country and of the state of the reforms can you paint after 4 years of perestroyka?

[Sakharov] Our country is passing through a difficult and even critical phase. The Congress of People's Deputies in May and June this year closed the first stage of perestroyka. It was a great political education; virtually the whole country witnessed it, thanks to television. People even took special leave for a few days to ensure that they missed nothing.

It was a historic event for us. We knew many things, but often just part of the truth, without suspecting how much we knew. The Congress enabled us to have a complete picture. It marked the end of illusions about the path followed for decades.

For instance, we realized that the official system of full social justice was a lie: 40 million people are living below the poverty line, with an income of less than 70 rubles per month. We also realized that we were at the maximum level of exploitation, in the classical Marxist sense of the term: Just 35 percent of the national income goes to the remuneration of the work force. We learned that more than half of rural hospitals do not have running water—I am not talking about hot water—and that many more do not have mains drainage. We also found out about the ecological disaster, the tragedy of the Aral sea, the damaging effects of the cotton monoculture, the high rate of infantile mortality in Central Asia, and so forth.

Indeed, the central administrations are only concerned with their own interests. Each is outside the regions and the local authorities are totally powerless. Take the example of the Land Reclamation and Water Resources Ministry, which is responsible for funding water resources and which has a budget of 15 billion rubles: Only between 2 and 3 percent of this budget goes to irrigation; the rest serves to finance projects which are necessary to it because they are costly and which justify a structure comprising 60,000 people in its research department alone.

[Interviewer] Has there been no change in these administrative structures since the formation of the new government this summer?

[Sakharov] There has been no change. Our system comprises administrative departments, with the parallel party structure. It does not want to change, and the new government has not changed anything. Recently Abalkin (deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers responsible for the economic reform) wrote that this can only change when the state of crisis has been overcome. In other words, not before 1991....

There are now several bills before the Supreme Soviet: on ownership, on the agrarian reform, on cooperatives, and on the socialist enterprise. I have not had time to study them in detail, but at first sight these bills contain progressive elements. But these are diluted by vague formulations, reservations, and nuances. Experts in the Interregional Group, of which I am a member, say that they are not satisfactory. Moreover, even if they were, they would be ineffective because they imply a change in the Constitution which has not yet been made. For the time being, therefore, there is primarily discussion. We are told that action will come later.

In the same way, the 1990 budget was drafted according to old practices. Accepting this budget means that there will be no change in 1990. In addition to that there is the foreign debt, the devaluation of the ruble.... We are told that all these economic problems threaten us with a political crisis, a return to Stalinism. In fact we already have Stalinism.

[Interviewer] Could you tell us about this Interregional Group of reforming deputies of which you are a member?

[Sakharov] It is still fragile, it is trying to take shape. It emerged in the final days of the Congress of People's Deputies. When it was mentioned for the first time on the platform, Gorbachev was furious at this unexpected event; the microphones were even switched off to prevent us from talking.

The group met without me because I was in the United States at the time. Its members elected five joint chairmen: economist Gavriyl Popov, Yuriy Afanasyev, who is in charge of archives, Baltic deputy Viktor Palm, Boris Yeltsin, and Sakharov. An organizational meeting was then held, which I attended, and it gave us the job of meeting Lukyanov (Footnote 1) (First deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet) to obtain his support. We requested permission to have our own newspaper and a bank account. That was refused.

[Interviewer] How many deputies does this group have?

[Sakharov] Around 400 (Footnote 2) (The Congress of People's Deputies comprises a total of 2,250 deputies).

but we do not know how many will be active members and to what extent. It is not a party, just a group of people who want free debates in the Congress. It is distinguished from the party by the fact that it is just a group of deputies—there is no structure, rules, or program. Moreover, this is not necessarily essential or useful. In addition, the members agree on certain important things, but not on everything. It is a political and intellectual force and we do not know how it will develop. Moreover, the group refused to have a chairman, which is ridiculous, but that decision was made without me. There are therefore five joint chairmen with equal po[illegible]

[Interviewer] What [illegible]k of developments in Eastern Europe?

[Sakharov] Events in Poland and Hungary, and in the Baltic republics, are very positive, and they are a good example for us.... It would be a tragedy if the process led to economic chaos. For the time being, the USSR is observing an attitude of noninterference, and this is the most we can expect. But if there is a return of the right-wing forces, there will be interference. Everything is linked.

[Interviewer] And what do you think about the local elections, scheduled for the coming months?

[Sakharov] These elections are very important. We must remove the party's control over local soviets. However, the electoral laws in the republics date from before the changes; they cannot be good. We are asking for the removal of the "constituency conference" procedure which filters candidacies and enables all kinds of manipulations. We must limit the right of the highly reactionary electoral commissions to annul elections on the pretext that the electoral law has been broken, and abandon the principle that a candidate can only find practical help from the administrative departments provided for that purpose: Under an egalitarian cloak, that enables all kinds of manipulations by the apparatus.

CPSU Secretary Stroyev Views Nationality Plenum

AU2809112589 Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian No 39, 25 Sep 89 pp 1,7

["First statement published abroad" by Yegor Stroyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR peoples deputy, and first secretary of the Orlov Oblast Party Committee, elected Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the 19-20 September plenum: "Bound by Thousands of Ties"; received by POGLED through NOVOSTI.]

[Text] I had the opportunity to participate in many CPSU Central Committee plenums in recent years. However, I do not remember another occasion on which a problem, so powerfully affecting the participants, has been discussed. The pain caused by the discord [razdor] among people of various nationalities in the republics in the Trancaucasia and other regions intertwines with the concern for my native Russia and my Orlov area.

Leafing through the pages of my notes made during the just-completed plenum, I note the most important thing: It is good that the CPSU Central Committee plenum returned to reviewing the nationalities issue with precisely the same understanding Lenin had for this issue. He considered it inadmissible to forget the great importance of the nationality issue in such a multinational state as Russia.

However, recent events showed that we—the CPSU and the country's leadership—not only underestimated this issue, but also left it in the hands of various kinds of equilibrists, who inflicted significant damage on the self-esteem of Soviet society. Relations among the nationalities joined the list of restructuring's most important problems. The opinions, fortified by extremism and bias, confronted the party with the necessity to precisely determine its political position.

I liked the dialectical approach of the plenum's participants toward the issue of forming a unitary state. During our history's Stalinist period, a serious bias developed in forming the unitary state. Now the plenum's report and the statements at it asserted the issue of expanding the rights of union and autonomous republics and enhancing the role of the nations and nationalities in anything related to creating national okrugs, regions, and councils.

At the same time, I express my solidarity with those participants who consider it inadmissible to turn our country into a confederation, rather than federation. We must constantly strengthen the republics in our multinational state. The representatives of the Russian areas are concerned with the mistakes in the nationality issue and economy Russia experienced. Despite the fact that Russia makes the largest gross contribution to the all-union budget, it itself became Cinderella in the family of the union republics. Its citizens' standard of living essentially remained lower than that of the citizens of the Baltic republics and other regions of the country. Could we accuse Russia under such conditions of stacking the cards in its favor, as some people do? Reading the reports on the national emotions and claims of national exclusivity, I try to see them in the context of the Orlov Oblast. What should we do if we follow the example of the nationalists? The oblast is considered purely Russian, however, people from tens of different nationalities are living and working in it. There are 70 of them in the party membership list alone. What could we say about the myriad of party members who live in the oblast and speak different languages? Are they not members of our communist family? Are they emigrants or some unwanted people?

The CPSU Central Committee plenum demonstrated that the nations of the USSR are bound by thousands of ties in all spheres of life. The national issue as such does not exist in a pure form. It closely intertwines with the sociopolitical, economic, and moral issues. Take economy for instance. To live according to your means is a laudable aspiration of every nation. However, one notes many distortions and dangers in the discussion related to the regional economic accountability. Certain people are trying to partly replace the central departments' bureaucratic oppression by similar oppression of local character and assert national autarky [natsionalna avtarkhiya] to the detriment of national economic relations, which are so much more needed and preferred.

Thus, I ponder in this context: What, for example, would the workers of the Orlov Steel Combine do? It supplies its production to 167 enterprises in the Baltic republics, 181 enterprises in the Trancaucasia, and more than 350 enterprises in the Central Asian republics. This means that economy itself dictates the necessity of internationalizing our state and strengthening relations among all regions, nations, and nationalities.

The plenum was invaluable in issuing guidelines for all important issues of nationality policy. I think that it is important that it decisively dealt with the most topical issue, specifically, it opposed the federative principle in CPSU structure and spreading its units into various national "apartments." This would undermine the party's consolidating foundation and contradict the strategic goals of restructuring.

CPSU Plenum Speech by Latvia's Vagris Published

PM0410103189 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 23 Sep 89 p 1

[LATINFORM account of "Speech by Ya.Ya. Vagris, First Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum" on 20 September; according to a footnote "The speech is published in full"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades!

The processes which are commonly called the growth of ethnic self-awareness and which have been defined as "ethnic awakening" in Soviet Latvia, are, in my view, not a by-product, but an integral part of perestroyka.

And it is perfectly logical that we should be discussing today not just the refinement of interethnic relations, but a new model for them, a new concept for the party's nationalities policy.

It was with satisfaction that we observed in the CPSU draft platform "The Party's Nationalities Policy in Present-Day Conditions" many of the provisions which were expressed in the republic during the preparation for this plenum.

When discussing the draft CPSU platform itself, the communists and working people of Soviet Latvia rated highly the overall democratic thrust and constructive nature of the document, although there was criticism that it had failed to pay sufficient attention to the specific historical and ethnic features of regions and republics and that some of its sections were to some extent merely formal statements.

The discussion of the draft CPSU platform coincided in our republic with the work of the 17th republican party organization Central Committee plenum, which ended with the adoption of the Latvian Communist Party action program for the period of preparation for its 25th Congress and on very important questions of a longer-term nature.

In the current complex situation, the Latvian Communist Party action program, devised on a collective and democratic basis and in accordance with glasnost, will, we believe, contribute to the consolidation of all healthy forces in society in the struggle to attain the goals of perestroyka and will have a stabilizing effect on social and political processes in the republic.

I want to draw your attention to just four problems, which have a direct bearing on the party's nationalities policy.

First, the Latvian Communist Party fully supports the CPSU platform conclusion on the need for radical transformations of the Soviet federation and on its qualitative renewal and advocates Latvia's sovereignty as part of a federation of Soviet republics based on treaty relations which reflect fully and concretely enough the specific features of the development of each republic or region.

It is a stable treaty system that can most effectively safeguard the right of each republic, including the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], to tackle questions of its state, economic, and public life independently.

The CPSU platform rightly stresses that the development of our federation will be stable and successful given an optimal correlation between the rights of the union republics and of the USSR as a whole. This requires a clear definition of the competence and mutual obligations of the Union and the republics.

The party's political attitude to the actual presentation of the issue is set out in the section "How to restructure the Soviet federation and make it full-fledged," but one cannot help seeing its intrinsic contradiction.

For example, Subsection 1 begins by listing what should fall within the Union's competence, although this is more like a list of a federative state's general functions without defining any framework of competence in their performance. It goes on to correctly assert that republics "are empowered to decide all questions of state and social life except those which they have voluntarily ceded to the Union."

If we wish to be consistent and take into account the aforementioned fundamental thesis that "a guarantee of our federation's durability is provided by the completely voluntary nature of the unification of union republics within a single union state, in which each republic retains its autonomy and has the right to participate on joint decisionmaking," as the platform says, then it must be admitted that republics' rights must be paramount because it is the republics that form the Union, rather than the other way around." [opening quotes not supplied]

Consequently, logic itself suggests that one should start by doing something else—by fully defining the rights and competences of the republics and then defining the limits to their sovereignty and the constraints which the union republics have to consciously and voluntarily accept for the sake of the existence and successful development of the union state. This should be taken into account by the Congress of People's Deputies when finally defining the competence of union republics and the Union.

Thus we favor real, not formal, sovereignty for the union republics, a new status, and the filling of our federation with modern substance, but we certainly do not favor its destruction.

Second, we regard as particularly important the CPSU platform conclusion that "the economic meaning of self-determination and sovereignty in present-day conditions is expressed in the republics' transfer to economic accountability and self-financing."

On 1 January next year Latvia switches to the new conditions, and our main task in the sphere of the republic's socioeconomic development is to ensure high-quality preparation for this. One of the first major real steps in perestroyka in a sphere in which so far there has still been little success is being taken. The Latvian Communist Party's prestige will depend to a large extent on how we cope with this task. People expect us to really demonstrate our ability to fully bring into play the tremendous, still untapped potential contained within the Soviet federation. Both the transition and work in the new conditions will be the best argument against manifestations of separatism, for they will graphically demonstrate our ability to solve urgent socioeconomic problems within the context of the USSR.

I must say that our actions to transfer the republic to economic accountability and self-financing meet with understanding at the level of the country's top party and state leadership, but at lower ministerial levels we run up against departmental egoism and sometimes even a reluctance to go into this problem.

Unless we smash the bureaucratic and departmental obstacles through common efforts, there will be no success either in our republic or in the others and our entire economic accountability and economic autonomy will exist only on paper.

We listened carefully to Comrade Maslyukov's speech. Yuriy Dmitriyevich, we know and greatly value your energy and efforts in resolving problems of economic accountability, but we are worried by the fears expressed yesterday regarding the radical steps upheld by the Baltic republics. In present conditions sluggishness and irresolution can produce only negative results.

We are prepared to act in conditions that are in many respects experimental and to assume responsibility. We believe that initiatives that today are still an experiment but in a while may become the practice for many people should be supported in the common interest.

I would like to emphasize again that the change in the relationship between the union and the republics and their new status do not constitute an aim in themselves. The goal is to place the entire spectrum of relations on a natural, normal basis of mutual interest, equivalence of exchange, and stability and predictability of ties and pledges.

We are still dependent on each other and must stay together, but not because we are doomed to do so but because we are vitally interested in this.

Third, the republic is vigorously and trenchantly discussing the problem of the perestroyka of the party itself. The conclusions of the 18 July 1989 conference at the CPSU Central Committee, and also the approaches outlined in the draft CPSU platform served as a considerable stimulus to debate.

In parallel with the union republic's attainment of real sovereignty, the status of its Communist Party must also change. After all, one without the other will inevitably turn into a purely formal declaration. In our opinion, the process must harmoniously embrace both aspects of the political reform: the perestroyka of state and party relations.

To put it briefly, we are faced objectively, by virtue of the very logic of perestroyka, with the problem of a new status for the union republic Communist Party. The dialectics here are simple: The status of the Latvian Communist Party within the CPSU must be consonant with Soviet Latvia's real sovereignty as part of the USSR. "No more, but no less," as the saying goes.

Fourth and last, in many regions of our country, including the Baltic republics, the problems that have accumulated over past decades precisely in the sphere of national relations are a kind of catalyst of social tension. The Latvian Communist Party bases its nationalities policy on the clear understanding that Latvian soil is the only historical territory where the free development of the Lettish nation, its culture, and its language can be ensured, but at the same time guarantees of the development of the language and culture of all the national and ethnic groups living there must be created.

The renewal of nationalities policy and the elimination of the deformations of past years are impossible without overcoming dogmatism in understanding the dialectics of national and international values and interests. This cannot be achieved unless real policy is based on a recognition that the national is an integral part of the general human, that national nihilism has nothing in common with internationalism, and that true internationalist values take shape only on the basis of national values, and not in place of them or as a counterweight to them.

The principle of "national self-criticism," as it were, is of exceptional significance for the practice of interethnic contact in general and in our republic in particular. We therefore deem it expedient that Paragraph Six in the section "On the Ideological-Theoretical Aspect of the Nationalities Question" in the CPSU platform should be supplemented with the following thesis: "It is the duty of communists to take an active stance against manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, primarily within their own nation, and must prevent by all means reciprocal interethnic criticism in society and the mass media."

Comrades! Substantial changes in sociopolitical life have taken place within a short time in Latvia, they are proceeding in a contradictory fashion, and political radicalism has been making itself felt, especially of late. This is also mentioned with alarm and concern in the CPSU Central Committee Statement of 26 August this year.

It aroused a broad and distinctly mixed reaction in the republic and prompted a large number of articles and reports in the mass media of the whole country.

During these days we have often turned to the words of the draft CPSU platform reminding us that, "in countering any manifestations of nationalism, it is important to be sensitive and responsive to all legitimate national demands and aspirations."

Indeed, the situation in Soviet Latvia remains complex and equivocal in many respects thanks to the actions and appeals of certain representatives of particular social formations to suit their overweening political ambitions.

But the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is convinced, and stated as much in its address to the republic's Communists and all its working people, that the activeness of the extremist groupings attempting to bar the way to perestroyka from various directions does not have and cannot have a decisive influence on the processes of renewal in the republic.

The destiny of the Lettish people and all of Latvia's inhabitants is directly and inseparably linked with the success of the policy of socialism's renewal throughout the Soviet Union. We realize that there can be no Latvian sovereignty without perestroyka, just as there can be no perestroyka or renewal of socialism on Latvian soil without Latvian sovereignty. We share a common path, and therein lies our responsibility to the peoples and to history.

More on Vezirov CPSU Plenum Speech

PM0310093589 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 23 Sep 89 pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "Discussion at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum—Speech by A-R. Kh. Vezirov, First Secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 20 September 1989: Toward a New Quality of Interethnic Relations Based on Leninist Principles"]

[Text] Comrades, We are discussing one of the most important questions of our society's life—the activity of the party.

It may be said without exaggeration that without a new nationalities policy there can be no success in the reform of the political system or in economic transformations. The elaboration and implementation of the new policy are extremely important not for that reason alone—after all, it affects the most sensitive and delicate sphere of social relations.

On the whole the CPSU's platform reflects the real state of affairs and gives a correct idea of the essentials. The draft has been actively discussed in our republic. I would like to mention some of the most important comments and proposals made by our republic's party organization and working people.

The draft points out in particular that the final decision on disputed issues between union republics and autonomous formations belonging to them is made by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. We are suggesting that it be specified in principle that this cannot be applied to territorial questions, wherever they may arise. Only if the principle of the republics' sovereignty is observed will this provision work to strengthen the federation of the USSR.

We fully endorse M.S. Gorbachev's statement regarding the impermissibility of recarving borders. That path leads to anarchy and the disintegration of the state. Encroachment on the territorial integrity of a union republic should be regarded as a state crime. Perhaps we should enshrine this principle in legislation and incorporate this provision in the CPSU platform.

The way people in Europe regard the prevailing political realities on the question of the borders existing there should serve as a a good example to us.

The Central Committee plenum should express itself firmly and clearly against attempts to change the law in favor of narrow national aspirations and to seek advantages for one people at the expense of others and, in particular, of countrywide interests.

Moreover, it seems to us that a clear statement should also be made on such a question as a nation's right to self-determination. This right, as is well known, is possessed by a nation as a whole and not by individual sections of it. I would like to stress another thing too. The principle of self-determination cannot be reduced solely to the right to secede. It also entails expanding opportunities for self-management and the utilization of all the federation assets, and therefore a responsibility to its members.

In defining nationalities policy at the present-day stage, our party is essentially completing the elaboration of the concept of perestroyka, which organically combines three very important elements of it—political reform, economic reform, and the renewed nationalities policy.

An integrated concept of perestroyka will make it possible to clearly define the ultimate goals and makeup of society for which we are striving. But that is not enough. It is particularly important that the specific stages, methods, and sequence of actions be designated. We do not, unfortunately, yet have this.

Our great country is huge. And this requires profound understanding and consideration of many factors—traditions, culture, way of life, and the level of development of each people and of all regions. Neglect of this diversity and a simplistic attitude to the dialectics of national and international questions are the reasons why, in particular, we proved ill-prepared for such a drastic turn of events in the sphere of interethnic relations.

A fundamental analysis of the causes of this and of the deviations from the principles of Lenin's nationalities policy has been provided in M.S. Gorbachev's report. We regard the ideas expressed in it as productive. Their implementation will raise our federation to a qualitatively new level and create favorable opportunities for the proper and free development of all the USSR peoples.

The national processes in Azerbaijan are proceeding in a complex and contradictory fashion. The burden of many unresolved problems built up over decades has affected them, as it has affected processes throughout the country. These include a shortage of 500,000 jobs in a republic of 7 million people, distortions in the development of its economy, neglect of the social sphere, alienation of the broad masses from active policical activity, deviations in cadre policy, and a flouting of social justice. All this generated a very strong field of social tension which antirestructuring forces have not failed to exploit for their foul purposes.

I say this with the aim of avoiding that unthinking and harmful practice whereby one side points to the other and puts all the blame on it. And we cannot, unfortunately, speak of such a practice in the past tense.

The Karabakh drama has now been going on for around 2 years. A number of speakers have broached this topic. It has been addressed by Comrade Volskiy. I do, of course, have something to say on the questions raised by him. But I would just like to stress that he could certainly be more self-critical and objective. After all, in his own words, the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has become much worse in the period during which the Special Administration Committee that he heads has been in operation.

Comrades, appreciable damage has been done to the friendship of the peoples, the unity of the country, and the cause of restructuring. The conflict has been so protracted in character primarily because separatist and nationalist forces have throughout this period been actively supported by certain circles in Armenia and by the Armenian diaspora while, on the other hand, our nationalist forces have shown an unwarranted refusal to compromise.

All this incredibly complicates and aggravates our work and undermines efforts aimed at normalizing relations between our two peoples. Nationalist passions are being fomented and impatience is growing.

We categorically condemn the blocking of roads and what is being done against a neighboring republic. The first trains have gotten through thanks to measures taken. But I would not like to give the impression, comrades, that only one side is to blame for all this. And, of course, I would want you to listen to the condemnations as well as the expressions of readiness to act coming from Armenian comrades too. Everything must be done together.

We have done and will continue to do everything within our power to prevent ethnically motivated outbursts of passion. People who have committed unlawful actions have been punished. But I would also like to state the following: One of the main causes of the unsanctioned rallies and strikes which took place in Baku last November and in recent days is the fact that many people demand an answer to the question: Why is interference in a sovereign republic's internal affairs being allowed? We are unable to explain to people why the entire Azerbaijani population has been expelled from Armenia, why conditions for its return have not been created, and why there has not so far been any compensation even for the damage it has suffered. We are asked why there has been no appraisal of the stance of the communists who allowed all this to happen.

Way back in February 1988 the CPSU Central Committee Politburo unambiguously declared that changes in the national-territorial structure of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] were impermissible. This position was also confirmed at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sitting in July last year and at meetings between the leadership of the party and the state with representatives of both republics. And if everyone had been guided by these fundamental directives it might have been possible to avoid such tragic consequences.

Here I would like to specially emphasize the following thought: For the time being the inertia of the old approach operates: All hopes are pinned on the center alone being capable of solving every question. Unfortunately, we have long been taught this. We do not reject the benefits derived from various kinds of commissions and deputies' groups visiting us. The NKAO Special Adninistration was set up in virtually the same way.

But frankly, we ourselves must take primary responsibility for solving all questions. Particularly as we are moving toward full sovereignty, and sovereignty means not only rights but also a high sense of responsibility.

That is why the republic's Supreme Soviet, proceeding from the premise that the Special Administration Committee has not justified the hopes pinned on it, deemed it necessary to petition the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for the committee's abolition.

We perceive the solution to the NKAO problem solely within a constitutional framework, including the creation of the requisite conditions for ensuring elections and a resumption of activity by party and soviet organs. The republic guarantees the safety of all citizens in the oblast and the satisfaction of their needs in the economic, social, and cultural spheres, and we will, of course, take care to ensure that the practice which led to these events never recurs.

Comrades, the problem of the NKAO forms only part of the great tragedy which has occurred between our two peoples. The matter has gone very far. It demands very great and intense work from us. It is never too late to start doing good deeds. The leadership of Azerbaijan has advocated and continues to advocate dialogue, cooperation, and mutual understanding. A meeting of Azerbaijan and Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau members was recently held to this end, at which we again put forward the concept of interethnic reconciliation.

We wholeheartedly welcomed yesterday's appeal by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the leadership and the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, the speaker went on, to prevent outbursts of passions and to stop and show wisdom and restraint.

We will not swerve from this path, we will not allow emotion to prevail over reason. We urge people to decisively dissociate themselves from the dark forces and to resolve practical questions and contradictions together step by step. This is not an easy path, but we must travel it together.

Comrades, the report and the debate speeches prove that a well-organized system for the management of nationalities processes must be created in the country. It must embrace the party, which elaborates the strategy of nationalities policy, the soviets, through which this policy is implemented by means of laws and practical actions, and the sphere of ideological and theoretical activity.

I feel that there is a pressing need to create not just commissions but a special CPSU Central Committee Department for Interethnic Relations headed by a Central Committee secretary.

There is something else I must say. At meetings in this hall one often hears complaints about blunders, economic backsliding, and declining party prestige. It is claimed that we are going in the wrong direction. Of course, by no means everything is running smoothly in our country. But the country is alive and following its chosen path—maybe not at the pace we would like, but we are certainly not standing still.

Our republic, for example, despite all the difficulties which I mentioned, has managed to achieve some progress in the implementation of priority programs, which have enjoyed the people's support and approval. The profits plan has been overfulfilled by our national economy as a whole. The number of loss-making enterprises has been halved in 1 year. A lot of housing is under construction. Even now, before the transition to self-financing, Azerbaijan meets its own budgetary revenue requirements without any union subsidies. Rural working people, despite the drought, met the plan for vegetable deliveries to all-union stocks. We have already delivered more than one-half of the planned harvest quantities of cotton, grapes, and other crops, and this is much more than last year.

All this helps to enhance the prestige of the republic's party organization. Its ranks are swelling, the nucleus of workers is strengthening. But much more still remains to be done, and we are steering the republic's communists and all its working people in that direction.

We well appreciate that the unity of our multinational society is inextricably bound up with strengthening the unity of the Communist Party. We fully agree with the platform's tenet regarding the danger of the party's dividing along national lines. We must face up to the truth: The nationalism which has spread among communists poses a great danger for the party today. Internationalism is party members' ideological creed. The party's prestige and its vanguard role in perestroyka depend on the consistent and persistent implementation of the party's renewed nationalities policy and the consolidation of its inherent internationalist line.

Commission Reviews Effect of Perestroyka on Press

LD2209102589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1735 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Sep [TASS]—Today a session of the Central Auditing Committee of the CPSU took place. The state of work with letters, declarations, and complaints from workers at the editorial offices of the papers SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and STROITELNAYA GAZETA, and the magazines PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN and AGITATOR was thoroughly examined.

Participants at the sitting were familiarized beforehand with the outcome of the check at the editorial offices. The speakers spoke about the fact that people's activeness, exactitude, and intolerance of deficiences have increased in the conditions of perestroyka. One testimony to this is the increase in the quantity of applications of working people to the editorial boards of the central party publications.

While indicating positive changes in the activity of editorial office collectives, the speakers at the same time noted that no fundamental improvement has taken place in the work with letters and applications of working people. The editorial offices are still interacting poorly with readers, and are insufficiently reflecting public opinion on a number of topical issues in the life of the country. Close contacts have not been arranged everywhere with local party committees.

Information about members of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission fulfilling the instructions given to them was also heard at the sitting.

'Naive' Hope of U.S. Aid for Perestroyka Derided

PM0310122189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 89 p 3

[A. Vasilyev article under the rubric "Viewpoint": "Will the West Help Us? This Question Is Significantly More Complex Than What We Sometimes Suggest When Writing About the West's Reaction to Perestroyka in the USSR"]

[Text] The situation in the country now is such that the public's attention is focused mainly on our internal problems.

Foreign policy is another matter. The affairs of our foreign policy departments are rarely discussed when people are waiting in line for soap, and, consequently, if it is said on television that the new thinking is making gigantic strides across the planet, then it must be so. Well, when you think about it, construction workers are hardly going to go on strike because cement has not been delivered to the construction site of the "common European home."

One of the outstanding events at the first USSR Supreme Soviet session was M.S. Gorbachev's speech on the results of visits to Britain, the FRG, and France and about participation in the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference. But it is not the speech itself but what Deputy A.P. Fedorov said about it and the question he put to the Soviet president which is important for me now: "I think that your speech is a superb first step on the path to professionalizing the deputy corps on questions of foreign political activity. In this connection I would very much like to know your personal opinion on our international journalists' activity. Does it not seem to you—it seems so to me, that's why I am asking—that they are too one-sided, biased, and superficial and that in some places our foreign policy actions are assessed even in euphoric terms, whereas their Western colleagues assess each of our foreign political actions and every agreement quite analytically. That doesn't happen in our country, yet we deputies, I think, are very much in need of it in the conditions of our reality." (PRAVDA, 2 August 1989, page 2).

Precisely, Comrade Deputy! I would only add that, unfortunately, it is not only journalists who are subject to euphoria. The behavior of our official representatives in the international arena sometimes reminds me of Natasha Rostova's position at her first ball: She wanted to dance so much, and no one asked her. We seem to have restructured ourselves, and amazed everyone with glasnost. It still seems that someone intelligent, handsome, and definitely clad in white will come and offer us the most modern technology, terrifically favorable credits, and a place in the world market. But the waltz and the mazurka have come and gone and he—the man in white—still hasn't arrived.

The discrepancy between the assessments made by some of our officials and the reality is particularly marked in the example of Soviet-U.S. relations. So, in an article by one of our prominent Foreign Ministry representatives, published in the paper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, we read: "The switch to the 'new agenda' in Soviet-U.S. relations is determined—and this is the main point—by the new climate in them. This, in my view, is marked by the sincere desire of many Americans to make their contribution to the progress of affairs in our country, by a desire to help our perestroyka. Or, at least, not to create additional complications for it." (MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, No 36, 3 September 1989 p 9). This statement, in my view, is only partially correct. The whole question is about which Americans this applies to and to what degree they influence White House foreign policy.

For example, specialists at the Foreign Policy Institute at the Johns Hopkins University, who published a report entitled "The Future of U.S.-Soviet Relations" in June this year, enjoy that kind of influence. The report says in particular: "Our policy must be to gradually link liberalization (of U.S. policy regarding the USSR—A.V.) with our assessment of the broad structural transformations in the Soviet Union in a broad range of political, social, and humanitarian indicators, instead of linking U.S. decisions with some specific or exceptional actions by the USSR in the sphere of human rights which may not correspond to a more general tendency."

Incidentally, people in our country repeat with special satisfaction that G. Bush is a "pragmatist" and that, consequently, the new administration's policy will be "pragmatic" and not "ideologized." First, this does not correspond to the reality. In the present administration there are enough influential right-wing figures who, in their hatred for socialism and communism, would give 100 points to the "ideologist" R. Reagan.

In the summer of this year I happened to talk with N. Podgorets, a prominent theoretician of the U.S. Neoconservative Movement. The conversation, naturally, was about the U.S. assessment of perestroyka. "If Gorbachev is appealing for a return to Leninist ideas of socialism,"

N. Podgorets said, "then there can be no question of democracy. I and other like-minded people clearly assess Lenin as a figure of the totalitarian type." These two sentences contain the essence of present-day contradictions between "deideologized" perestroyka thinking in the USSR and the position of U.S. conservatives, who are determining the U.S. political course today.

Second, even supposing that G. Bush and his comrades-in-arms will really be reincarnated into "pragmatists" one fine day, this can in no way alter their attitude to the question of assisting Soviet perestroyka. Being "pragmatists," they will first of all ask themselves the question: But why? If we achieve the targets set by means of perestroyka, then the United States will have one more powerful rival with enormous labor and natural resources. If perestroyka collapses, then U.S. assistance will have been an unnecessary waste of effort.

Diplomats know that sometimes the most favorable tactic in international affairs is to wait. This seems to be precisely the policy that Washington is now cleaving to as regards Moscow. Admittedly, the "waiting game" is not easy for the administration since in the United States—a country of energetic and active people—people have always demanded action from the White House. Public opinion and some of the U.S. press is now resolutely advocating an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union and supporting M.S. Gorbachev and perestroyka. And under pressure from the Americans the White House is taking some steps toward meeting the Kremlin halfway, but... not along the road which we would want to follow most of all. Washington willingly agreed to set up the "new agenda" already mentioned, or the "fifth basket" of Soviet-U.S. relations—cooperation in solving world ecological problems, in combating drug addiction, terrorism and so on—thus both calming public opinion and masking its own reluctance to cooperate with us in solving our economic problems.

Do you remember how it all began? Four years ago we believed that we had only to half-open the doors to the vast Soviet market for the "imperialist sharks" to rush in in pursuit of ready money, that all that would remain for us to do would be to reject offers, choosing only the most profitable ones. Alas, how naive we were 4 years ago....

In the report entitled "The Future of U.S.-Soviet Relations" already mentioned we read: "The United States must not subsidize the Soviet economy at this time. Regular business practice determined by market considerations and profitability must be the criterion for firms' and banks' participation." There is probably no need to demonstrate that Soviet market conditions are by no means conducive to Western business people's profitability.

There is one more factor exerting a major influence on the prospects of economic cooperation with the West: political instability in the USSR. The Western businessman is also an astute politician, who will never put major financial means into a country if he has misgivings about its future. In addition, the constantly changing Soviet legislation, or rather those articles which regulate entrepreneurial activity in the USSR, frightens off business people. And, of course, the struggle which has recently developed against the cooperative movement is not helping to attract Western investments.

An inadequate picture of Soviet-U.S. relations emerges because, as top-level meetings and contacts between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state have become more frequent, and also as bilateral talks are being held on various questions, our attention is drawn more to the external aspect of these relations—the trips, the smiles, the handshakes—than to the essence of the talks and the results. And yet this question needs to be investigated separately.

The Soviet side is conducting talks on equal terms with the United States on problems of disarmament and regional conflicts. It is precisely here that in the near future major results can be expected, since stopping the arms race and reexamining Soviet policy in the "Third World" accords with both countries' interests.

As for talks on the problems of economic cooperation and human rights, well, pardon me, we are waiting here with outstretched hands.

We began to recognize every person's right to live where he wants only when we realized that we could not survive without the West's economic and technical assistance. It was as if the Soviet representatives at the talks had been replaced!

The subject of human rights is infinite. Any problem in the life of Soviet people can be used by Washington with the aim of putting pressure on Moscow. U.S. congressional documents testify that in the near future such subjects as freedom of association, that is freedom to form political parties, and also the right to work, to housing, to essential social and medical services will be the focus of a campaign in defense of human rights in the Soviet Union.

Having initially lumped together the problem of human rights and prospects of trade and economic cooperation, the United States by no means undertook to separate them in the event that Soviet emigration legislation was liberalized. So it is simply naive to count on the USSR's shortly being admitted to the circle of developed capitalist countries.

On the whole, Britain's THE GUARDIAN newspaper characterized Soviet-U.S. relations accurately: "Moscow believes that the process of economic and political reforms in the country, the reduction of military expenditure, the establishment of new relations with Europe, and the granting of major Western economic and technical assistance are interdependent elements both in the grand restoration of the Soviet Union's strength and in the restoration of international order. The United States, on the contrary, is beginning to interpret the changes taking place in the socialist countries in the last few years from triumphal positions. The warmth which characterized U.S.-Soviet relations at certain times in Reagan's last administration has been replaced by the general feeling that the communists have been beating a retreat everywhere.... The Soviet Union's complexion has changed: Whereas earlier it was considered a powerful state, making concessions only for carefully considered reasons, now it has taken on the form of a state worn out by its problems and continually running into crises."

It is distressing to read such words, but now we only need the truth, however bitter it is. We need to realize that we will have to get ourselves out of the quagmire in which we find ourselves.

And in conclusion I would like to return to what Deputy A.P. Fedorov said. For a competent discussion of the questions of international policy our people's deputies need to obtain the appropriate information from sources which are independent of foreign policy departments.

Third Alternative Latvian Constitution Outlined

PM0410083589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Irina Litvinova report from Riga under general rubric "Direct Line. Own Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "Draft on Electing the President of the Republic"]

[Text] The Latvian jurists' society has submitted to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet a somewhat unexpected draft law on direct elections of the president of the Latvian SSR and corresponding amendments to the republic constitution. It has been conceived to produce a model under which the Supreme Soviet would be elected directly, bypassing the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies. So as not to complicate the presidential election procedure, it is proposed to hold it simultaneously with elections of Latvian SSR people's deputies. Among the powers vested in the president would be the right to refuse to sign laws passed by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, sending them back to the Supreme Soviet within 10 days for repeated consideration, giving the reasons for his decision. Under this model, the authors of the draft law claim, "the president serves as a certain alternative counterbalance to the Supreme Soviet and forms an additional guarantee for a sensible adoption of laws in keeping with the constitution." Latvian SSR citizens, born in Latvia and having lived on its territory permanently for at least 10 years, proficient in Latvian and Russian, qualify for election as president.

The "presidential draft" is the 3d version of the draft law "On Amendments and Additions to the constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Latvian SSR." The two previous ones were drawn up by a deputies' commission and by a working group established by the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. One of these options envisages the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet as the supreme organ of state power, the other option assigns this role to the Latvian SSR Congress, which confirms the permanently functioning council of the republic consisting of equal numbers of deputies from rayons and from cities and urban rayons.

All three versions of the draft law on amendments and additions to the republic constitution and a draft law "On Elections of Latvian SSR People's Deputies" will be submitted for consideration by the 13th session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, to be held 6 October. The session is to adopt decisions on servicemen's participation in elections and the numerical composition of territorial electoral okrugs in Latvia.

Communists Seen Leading Change in Estonia

PM0310105789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with Ya. Allik, first secretary of Vilyandiskiy Estonian Communist Party Rayon Committee, raykom, by L. Levitskiy: Do Not Dictate—Consult: The Style of the Party Leadership of the Processes of Perestroyka Is Considered by Ya. Allik, first secretary of the Vilyandiskiy Estonian Communist Party Raykom"; date and place not specified—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Yaak Allik is one of those well-known and respected Estonian intellectuals whose opinion is taken into account. His renown is partly "inherited." His parents, O. Lauristin and Kh. Allik, were active builders of the Estonian Soviet Republic in 1940. Ya. Allik worked at the republic's Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee, taught philosophy at Tartu University, and caught the eye as an incisive theater critic, editor of the journal TEATR I MUZYKA, and artistic director of the independent "Ugala" theater in Vilyandi. He ran successfully for the nomination as deputy chairman of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] State Committee for Culture and minister of the Estonian SSR. Soon after that he turned down the ministerial portfolio and was elected first secretary of Vilyandiskiy party raykom. At a recent Estonian Communist Party plenum Ya. Allik was coopted into the Central Committee and elected a member of the Central Committee Bureau.

[Levitskiy] You are one of the new wave. They even claim that Yaak Allik has been a People's Front member for some time...

[Allik] In spring last year, when the People's Front was born, I was artistic director of the "Ugala" theater. I was approached as the owner of the largest auditorium in the rayon: Let's set up a People's Front rayon organization. Around 100 people attended the first meeting. At the end of the evening, when the talking was over, I said: The majority of you must clearly replace those who are on the rayon soviet. And the Communists sitting here will probably replace those who consider themselves party members but who are passive, inert. You have ideas, you are active and ready to struggle. So let us join these organizations on legitimate grounds and direct them. I did not subsequently take part in the People's Front activity, even though I was invited.

[Levitskiy] But why? And do you not regret leaving the quiet and cozy ministerial office in old Tallinn?

[Allik] I am convinced that the radical restructuring of our society and the country's political mechanism entails restructuring internal party life. That is precisely why I agreed to stand on the ballot for raykom first secretary. It will soon be 1 year since I took up the job, and I do not regret it.

[Levitskiy] But why did Communists create the People's Front, and why are they now playing a leading role in it?

[Allik] Many of them, the active and independently minded, had no real opportunity to engage in meaningful social activity. Compliant people, those convenient to the leadership, were nominated and promoted within the party, as in the economic and cultural spheres. It was the triumph of incompetence. There was nothing for resourceful Communists to do but join the informal organizations.

[Levitskiy] How in such an unusual situation do you implement the thesis of the party's leading role? Have you found your place in the trio of production, Soviet power, and party raykom?

[Allik] I think that one should not talk about the transfer of power to the soviets but about the soviets' struggle for power. But I have no doubt that there will be quite a few Communists in the future local soviets. We will really turn into the ruling party of a democratic society and will have to build its structure according to the generally accepted norms of parliamentary democracy. From time to time someone will ask: Should the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee also be chairman of the Supreme Soviet? I have heard no doubts about it in the British or West German parliaments. According to that logic the party's entire structure should be restructured. Its chief cultural theoretician should be minister of culture. Its main agricultural specialist should be minister of agriculture.

[Levitskiy] How do the raykom and its secretaries feel in the present situation?

[Allik] Often when I visit villages they show me large livestock units and production facilities built on my predecessors' orders. One of them, even though he enjoyed prestige in the rayon, was removed from office for understating milk yields and... was assigned to lead the republic's television service. Henceforth, then, the raykom bureau won't be in charge of agriculture, industry, or culture... The bureau discussed the main concepts of the development of the rayon's economy and culture and ways of transferring industry to economic accountability. We sought to prevent economic problems from developing into political ones. So it was necessary to conduct a serious examination of the organization of work in schools, to draw attention to the equipment of the rayon center, and to ensure that the distribution of extremely scarce goods was fair. Mutual understanding was reached with rayon links of the People's Front, the Greens, and other movements. We have done a lot together, and we shall go into the local soviet elections together. The platform has already been discussed by the consultative council of the social movements created on the raykom's initiative.

[Levitskiy] So there are no problems?

[Allik] There are none of the acute problems which upset the population in some of the republic's cities. I have in mind the laws on the state language and on local soviet elections. Our rayon is multinational, too, but the majority of the nonindigenous population have lived here for a long time. Interethnic problems are acute where migration is high and where production collectives are formed almost entirely of Estonians or immigrants; contradictions between social organizations are more acute there as well.

We have avoided that. The former leader of the People's Front, a lawyer by training, is now raykom secretary in charge of ideology. The current leader of the People's Front is a member of the raykom bureau, as are a Greens activist and an elder of the Farmers' Union. At the International Movement's republic congress people said: "Bring the People's Front under the control of the party raykom!" The absurdity of such views is obvious, I think.

[Levitskiy] But given such an eruption of social activeness, why did the Estonian Communist Party need to catch up with events rather than anticipate them?

[Allik] The Estonian Communist Party has 110,000 members. That is rather a lot in a republic of 1.5 million people. Therefore one can no longer talk about complete ideological unity. Virtually all the republic's political tendencies are represented in the Communist Party. They are headed by Communists. Party members organize strike committees and the so-called citizens' committees of Estonia. Nevertheless, demarcation is inevitable. Demarcation on the grounds of attitude to the IME [Estonian self-management] program, the draft of which is already under discussion.

The preparation of the Estonian Communist Party's action program has gone on too long. And the replacement of cadres in the Central Committee and its Bureau is also overdue. Had there been an extraordinary congress of the Estonian Communist Party in the summer of last year, there would have been no reason to hold the People's Front congress in the fall. At the moment the Communists who have earned prestige and recognition during the perestroyka years are realizing their potential in the informal organizations.

As for the Estonian Communist Party's draft action program, it seems to me to be quite restrained and therefore realistic. Only a party with authority can lead people toward radical changes. The trust and authority are returning. The sense of alienation has passed its peak. Other movements are offering quite a few enticing slogans and promises. But it is still the party which offers real deeds. The CPSU Central Committee Statement on the situation in the Baltic republics said: We are balancing on a knife edge. The noble mission of the Estonian Communist Party is to lead us back from the brink.

Estonian Front Leader Urges Renunciation of Pact

LD1409131989 Tallinn REEDE in Estonian 1 Sep 89 p 2

[Speech by Edgar Savisaar, chairman of the planning committee and member of the leadership of the People's Front, at the 23 August "The Baltic Road" demonstration on the Estonian-Latvian border]

[Text] It is true that injustice can be hidden away and violence kept quiet, but it does not become forgotten. And the longer the injustice continues, the more injustices it begets. Nobody, no country or people has the right to reproach us for our law on language, our electoral qualifications, or whatever else because all this has been a self-defence of an occupied people. Any accusation or reproach directed at us by whichever free and democratic country is amoral because we have not been free and independent for decades; we are just beginning to move in that direction.

In order to break the chain of injustices, one must free the cornerstone of the wall of injustice. This cornerstone was put in place 50 years ago. We expected that the leadership of the Soviet Union would understand the realities of the eighties and bring an end to injustice. However, what we have been waiting for did not come. The official juridical denunciation of the MRP [Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact] did not come. A public confession did not come with regard to what one can see on any schoolboy's political map of the world—that our three states indeed no longer exist on the map.

We are not asking today why the state assessment of the MRP did not come. But we acknowledge the fact and draw our own conclusions on the basis of the fact that the step in the direction of the truth which we had been expecting and which had been so firmly forecast by the whole world was not taken. It does not even interest us what was lacking this time—whether it wass resoluteness, political will, or attention toward minority nations. We know that what Moscow needed to do it left undone. A spade must indeed be called a spade. Genuine revolution and genuine perestroyka cannot be born from suppressed truths, cannot be born from a dirty conscience or from a lack of determination to admit this. One can trust the future steps of a state only when its honest attitude toward its past evokes one's confidence.

One might ask if we indeed need all this so much that this 50-year-old piece of paper is declared invalid. Yes, we do. There are documented historical events and there are juridical documents which, even if old, are still valid in their injustice. A crime has not come to an end while the criminal is enjoying the fruits of his crime. This is how it is now, and this is how it has always been. Do you remember the monologue by Claudius in "Hamlet"? Claudius asks himself if his repentance for the crimes committed is indeed genuine, and answers himself: No, it is not genuine because everything acquired criminally is still there—the throne, his country, the queen. Consequently, he continues to be a criminal.

We all know who signed the MRP agreement, who were the criminals then, and who they are now. There are no guilty peoples and there are no guilty nations, but there could be guilty states and guilty governments, and a new government would be freed from criminality only when it condemns its criminal predecessor. But if the authority does not understand or pretends not to understand what the people want from it, then the people express their will more clearly, repeatedly, and in a more and more demanding voice. Historical records and documents are merely pieces of paper if they are not backed by the will of the people. Today's Baltic Road, our chain of unity, is indeed the united will of the Baltic peoples, of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian peoples.

History teaches us that we must keep together. That is what we are doing tonight. Perhaps then, toward the end of the thirties, if we had kept together even a little bit more, our fate could have also have been different.

Each Baltic nation has its path, its future, and each will advance the way it wants, but knowing firmly that the other two will lend support. Our dreams are universal; we all want the same: We want families of our own, our state, our land. This is understandable to everybody. But each nation dreams their dreams differently and brings them into reality differently.

And, finally, once more about the MRP. We have no reason and even no right to retract our demands. Everything is clear to us. Making the MRP secret protocol public and the whole truth of 1939 and 1940 in fact only demonstrates whether or not the interests of the indigenous population are recognized, if the priority of the interests of the indigenous population is taken into account; it demonstrates if it is at all possible for us to implement the policy of renewing society and democratization of the parliamentary system, and being within the composition of the Soviet Union. Sooner or later Moscow will have to answer these questions, not only the single question about the MRP. And the longer the delay, the more the protraction, the more questions there will be and the louder the voice in which they are presented—presented by the whole people, and the answer is also demanded by the whole people.

Today is a hard day but not a day of mourning, because we have begun to see and we can see the darkness around us. We see it thanks to the fact that somewhere, far away, indeed, far away but still there, a new day is dawning for our peoples—a day of freedom.

KGB Responds to Report on Border Drug Traffic

PM0310104989

[Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 September 1989 publishes on page 4 under the headline "Drug Gang Operating Almost With Impunity on Soviet-Afghan Border" a 2,500-word article by our correspondent A. Ganelin, followed by a commentary by the Main and Political Directorates of the USSR KGB Border Guard Troops. Ganelin describes how "hunger and poverty" force Afghans in the Pamir mountain region to trade drugs or other prime necessities with Soviet drug traffickers. He notes that according to the drug smugglers themselves, crossing the Soviet border in this remote mountain region is "as simple as going to your neighborhood food store." The article describes the way the various gangs operate and assist one another and the "vast sums of money" involved in their business. The article describes attempts by drug gangs to intimidate border guards and deter them from testifying in court, and claims that such methods are "not only an attempt to demonstrate their strength to the border guards but also to transform the conflict between border guards and smugglers into a conflict between border guards and the local population." It also describes how gangs take advantage of and even try to aggravate social disorders so as to divert the security forces from their campaign against the traffickers. Ganelin concludes by stating that "at the moment we are on the defensive in the war against crime. We are retreating. The only question is, how much further?"

The commentary by the USSR KGB Border Guard Troops Main and Political Directorates reads in full as follows:

"The Main and Political Directorates of the USSR KGB Border Guard Troops consider that the questions raised in A. Ganelin's article are timely. Indeed, in past years, as a recent session of the USSR KGB Collegium noted, the actions of smugglers and currency speculators have become increasingly large-scale and affect the interests of our society as a whole. Various categories of Soviet citizens, particularly representatives of the young generation, are becoming involved in this criminal activity.

"Border guards also take an active part in the struggle against smuggling, including the drug business. In accordance with the USSR Law 'On the USSR State Border,' they are responsible for preventing in the prescribed manner, independently or in conjunction with customs institutions, the transportation across the USSR border of explosives, toxic, radioactive, or narcotic substances, weapons, ammunition, and other objects banned from import into the USSR or export from the USSR, as well as contraband items.

"In particular, in the region under discussion in the report, border guards have arrested 20 smugglers in the past 2 years and confiscated drugs and contraband items of great value from them. This was accomplished with the direct involvement of local party and soviet organs and the broad support of the population in the border region. For that reason we would like to draw attention to certain aspects of the article which, in our view, do not reflect the real situation entirely accurately. For example, to claim that the drug gangs are "operating almost with impunity on the Soviet-Afghan border and often enjoy the support of the local population" is untrue. The vast majority of border zone inhabitants are incensed at such incidents and give constant support and help to law-enforcement organs and border guards in the struggle against this criminal trade.

"The same applies to the episodes which talk about pressure on border guards from virtually the entire population. This is wrong because the pressure is being exerted by the criminal elements themselves. And to equate them with all the inhabitants of the border region is to fly in the face of the truth.

"At the same time, the stepping up of the drug smugglers' operations urgently requires corresponding changes to the organization of the border service, the improvement of cooperation with Internal Affairs Ministry services, and the further strengthening of professional ties with local party and soviet organs and of the traditional friendship with the population of the border region. These questions are at the center of attention of the Main and Political Directorates of the USSR KGB Border Guard Troops.

"We believe that the publication of the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA report on the drug business and on the smugglers' nefarious operations demonstrates Soviet people's heightened attention to increasing the reliability of border protection."

KGB Official on Chelyabinsk Stalinist Repressions

LD0410090289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television service in Russian in its "Vremya" newscast at 1430 GMT on 2 October broadcasts a video report by S. Sergeyev looking at the situation in Chelyabinsk oblast where a commission was set up in 1988 to study evidence of the repressions of the the Stalin era. Thousands of innocent people have since been rehabilitated, nearly all of them posthumously, he says. Over scenes of people laying flowers at a memorial in Zolotaya Gora, Sergeyev notes that Vremya recently reported on the reburial of 350 victims.

Sergeyev then interviews A. P. Surkov, deputy chief of the KGB directorate for Chelyabinsk oblast, asking the latter if there is precise information about the number of victims of Stalinist repression in the Chelyabinsk area.

Surkov replies: "We now have at our disposal authentic information about the scale of repressions in the territory of Chelyabinsk oblast. Some 37,041 people were repressed in our oblast by all the judicial and non-judical bodies—that is, the dvoykas, troykas, and special conferences. This figure includes 11,592 who were sentenced to the supreme measure of punishment. We view the work of the rehabilitation of those people who were unlawfully judged as our sacred and moral duty to the memory of the older generation, the fighters for democracy and socialism, and we are striving to restore their good names as quickly as possible."

[Video shows a meeting in progress; people looking at files of documents; group of people laying flowers at large stone tablet memorial to victims of the Stalinist repressions; and KGB man being interviewed]

New Orel Obkom Secretary Selected

18001697 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: " The Plenum of the Orel CPSU Obkom".]

[Text] Orel, 25 September, (TASS)—Today a plenum of the Orel oblast party committee [obkom] was held at which the organizational question was examined. The plenum relieved Ye. S. Stroyev of his duties as CPSU obkom first secretary in connection with his selection as secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

N.A. Volodin, who has worked as a secretary of this CPSU obkom, was selected as Orel Obkom Party First Secretary.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye. S. Stroyev spoke at the plenum.

Aircraft Bomb Hoaxer To Face Trial

PM0410135589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Own correspondent A. Karpov report: "He Carried the Joke Too Far"]

[Text] Dushanbe—Passengers on a TU-154, flight No 630 from Dushanbe to Moscow which departed 15 September, will remember the trip for a long time. This service leaves Tajikistan's capital late in the evening and arrives at Domodedovo Airport late at night. And, of course, it would have been best to have a nap for the 4-hour journey. But, alas, they weren't able to rest: A little over an hour after takeoff, USSR People's Deputy V. Giro, crew commander, asked everyone to get ready for a landing in Aktyubinsk.

"Official representatives" met the unexpected guests at the Kazakh city airport—fire engines and ambulances were lined up along the airstrip. The airliner had scarcely come to a standstill at the specially allotted area when an emergency evacuation of passengers began through the main and emergency exits, and along the usual and the inflatable gangways...

This is what happened. When the aircraft was already in the air, a man called Dushanbe Airport's information office. He asked: "Did flight 630 leave on time?" "Yes," the duty officer answered. "I would like to warn you," the anonymous caller said, "that there is an explosive device on board!" And intermittent whistles could be heard from the handset....

The alarm was sounded right away. At the command of Yu. Gerasimov, deputy chief of the Tajik Civil Aviation Administration, the TU-154 made for Aktyubinsk—the nearest airport at that point. At the same time the investigation organs began to search for the person who had reported the bad news.

"The whole procedure took less than an hour," S. Sharopov, the Dushanbe prosecutor, reported. "A. Kandov, an 18-year old photographer from the 'Rokhat' cooperative who took it into his head, for want of anything else to do, to 'enjoy a bit of a joke,' did not know of the existence of an electronic system which enables all calls to the airport services to be monitored, and so he was not a little surprised by the official visitors who came to his house in the middle of the night. An examination carried out confirmed the identity of the caller's voice. Criminal proceedings were instituted after this. Now the investigation is coming to an end. The young cooperative worker and joker has been accused of malicious hooliganism."

The court, before which A. Kandov will soon appear, will be open. It is proposed to broadcast it on television. And consequently it is hoped that this case will dissuade many people from being inclined toward black humor.

Economic

Defense Plants Seen Resisting Conversion

18230076a Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Sep 89 p 2

[Article by I. Klimenko: " 'Defense' on the Defensive"]

[Text] **It looks as if some well-heeled locusts have devastated our stores. You cannot find a TV set, a sewing machine, a refrigerator, or a cassette recorder for sale without restrictions.... There are no vacuum cleaners and washers. Are the old people not right in exclaiming with malice but fairly: Do we not have plenty of nothing?! But why?—asks the bewildered customer in his turn. Who is to blame? Finally, what is being done to make the state counter flourish?**

The first question is theoretical; the search to answer it has worn out many a pen on the pages of newspapers.... Let me only remind you that SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA was the very first to take a look at this problem in the article by V. Selyunin "Growth Rates on the Scales of Consumption." Alas, so far we still have not received a response from the competent authorities. However, the opinion of the public has been molded and cannot but affect (and has indeed affected!) the subsequent actions of these authorities.

Nor can you respond unambiguously to the question of who is to blame—is it the producer, or the salesman, or the system which allows both of them to enjoy the good life while the customer suffers? Let us visit a fair which has opened at the track-and-field complex of the TsSKA [Central Athletic Club of the Army] in the capital city in order to sort out all the "or's." The holding of the fair is a response of sorts to the third question of customers: What is being done?

So, there is this extra interrepublic wholesale fair. It is an extra fair because the main one held in the spring gave the sponsors no consolation. Specifically, in 1990 the enterprises of the defense complex have to deliver goods worth R28,777 million to the stores. Of this, 1 ruble in 5 was not confirmed by a contract at the spring fair. By mid-September(!) "defense" had failed to guarantee by contracts goods worth R767 million for the year now ending.

What kind of goods are these? Let me refer to an interview with I. Belousov, the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Military Industrial Commission: "Enterprises of the defense complex provide 100 percent of the all-union production of TV sets and household sewing machines, more than 97 percent of the refrigerators and cassette recorders, over one-half of the motorcycles, and about 70 percent of the electric vacuum cleaners and washing machines." I. Belousov proceeded to offer assurances that "now, under the conditions of conversion of military production, there is a real opportunity to increase the output of goods in order to meet the need for them...within the coming 2 to 3 years, and for some of them as soon as next year."

We should note that we have recently heard and read quite a lot about the great potential of "defense" with regard to its unclassified segment. Alas, these words have not put more goods on the store shelves. It also appears that the attitude of the leaders of the industry and enterprise managers toward their civilian production has been changing slowly. Even the most severe measures fail to help. This year such measures have been more numerous than ever before.

Let us recall that early in the year the status of producing consumer goods was considered at an enlarged meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers. Every minister was called to account before the government. Every minister swore that most serious measures would be taken. So what has happened? What is the result? "Industrial ministries of the defense complex...failed to prepare for the fair, to communicate the assortment and volumes of merchandise sales in 1990 to the USSR Ministry of Trade, and to ensure the appearance of enterprises at the fair in order to sign contracts."

These categorical conclusions were drawn by the fair committee at its first meeting and were confirmed by numerous facts. Specifically, as the fair committee maintains, the Minaviaprom [Ministry of the Aviation Industry] did not accept for the 1990 plan an order for 600,000 washing machines, 70,000 refrigerators, more than 300,000 vacuum cleaners, and 90,000 engine units (one-third of the all-union volume of deliveries). Naturally the organizers of the fair "brought this to the attention" and "imposed an obligation... within 24 hours...." The response of the ministries was nil. Of the R5.4 billion planned, only 1.5 million were covered by the deliveries of goods during the 5 days of the fair!

"Defense" is maintaining all-around defense and is steadfastly resisting the production of consumer goods in the amounts capable of "meeting the need for them," I. Belousov stated. In the process, defense industry functionaries refer to the poor availability of raw and other materials and subcontracted parts. The USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], and the USSR Gosarbitrazh [State Board of Arbitration] have given guarantees that supposedly everything necessary is going to be provided, and if they fail to obtain something, the defense industry will be protected from sanctions. However, "defense" yields only under the strongest pressure.

Why would it be that way? After all, at issue are the products for themselves, for their relatives and loved ones, all the more so since the Council of Minister now allows one-half of the increment in the output of goods to be retained for local consumption compared to the level of the previous year. Why isn't anyone interested? First, it turns out that the collectives still know little about the preferences granted by the Council of Ministers; second, it does not appear to be much of an influence on those who make decisions. After all, apart from many additional difficulties, increasing the volume of production of consumer goods holds no promise for the managers of defense industry plants. They receive their salary by virtue of their main products, and they are primarily responsible for them.

I foresee my dissatisfied reader saying: "There has got to be responsibility, however!" Let me assure you: These people are all right as far as responsibility goes. It is somewhat worse where industriousness and commercial drive are involved. They still prefer to ask and wait in instances when you now have to search and run ahead of yourself.

I selected the data on Minaviaprom from those on all defense ministries. I made a conscious choice. The point is that in the article "Window Dressing After...the Show" published on 29 August, I wrote about the lack of industriousness on the part of sponsors of the exhibition "Aviatekhnika-90." The following was said: "Enterprises of the Minaviaprom need not have given up their search for partners among either the suppliers or consumers of assemblies, subcontracted parts, and materials." One million visitors have seen the exhibition. There definitely were those among them who would have eagerly responded to an appeal for cooperation with a partner that strong. After all, this is very prestigious; this means access to advanced technologies. Alas, there have been no appeals, no advertisements. The leaders of the industry, feeling offended by the tone of the publication, sent an angry letter to the editorial office. It was as if they failed to notice substantive criticism. They shrugged it off. However, as the fair shows, they should not have shrugged it off. At present, the Minaviaprom refers exactly to the shortage of "assemblies, subcontracted parts, and materials."

This is also what representatives of the Minsudprom [Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry] complain about. But not all of them.

A. Ryaboshtanov, the chief of the Placement Department at a Minsudprom enterprise, agreed: "Certainly, there are shortages. The fair thus far is a notion from someone else's vocabulary. Allocation reigns here. This circumstance has spoiled us, and it has, putting it bluntly, altogether corrupted our trade."

A woman walked up and interrupted us: "What do you have for sale?"

Ryaboshtanov responded with a joke:

"The Slava cruiser. One piece. Will you take it?"

The woman followed suit: "Wrap it up. What else is in the package?"

"Here is a key chain—the dream of a motorist; here is a paper clip—the helper of a bureaucrat. See how convenient it is.... How many do you want?"

As they say, Aleksandr Borisovich has a silver tongue. He offered the goods in such a way that it was altogether impossible not to sign a contract. So there still are merchants in "defense." They should look for them better, find them, and appoint them for commercial work so that later they advance the once second-rate pursuit of "defense."

A. Ryaboshtanov said: "In 4 days I have sold trinkets worth many thousands. I am not saying this to blow my own horn, but as a rebuke to trade. Had we received cooperation from trade we would have provided goods for twice the amount. Trade is used to dictates, and has no desire to abandon them."

USSR Deputy Minister of Trade A. Chepik was indignant: "What dictates? We have been chasing representatives of industry for a week now. We have been unable to drag them to the fair even with the help of ministers."

In his turn, the chief engineer of the Department of Consumer Goods of the Minobshchemash [Ministry of General Machine Building] explained himself: "The plants have gotten out of line. They are out of control now. There has been no response to all our calls and telegrams."

I heard many mutual rebukes. They testify to just one thing: The organization of the fair was good for nothing. Having acknowledged this, the new chairman of the fair committee, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Gosplan V. Durasov announced that the sales would last "until 32 September if necessary," or, more precisely, until "the planned amount of goods is accumulated." Defense ministries said "yes" and "saluted." A department chief of the Minoboronprom [Ministry of the Defense Industry], S. Solomatin, put it to me this way:

"We have tied the hands of all our directors...."

Sergey Aleksandrovich made this look like a special achievement. However, he did not give any thought to this: Is it possible to work productively at present with your hands tied? Who will finally give it some thought?

State Civilian Conversion Plan Discussed

18230076b Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 18, Sep 89 p 11

[Commentary by V. Komarov, department chief at the State Military Industrial Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers: "Action!"]

[Text] The defense complex produces a good deal of civilian products and consumer goods. Their share in the overall volume of production amounts to 40 percent at present. In 1990 it will come to 49 percent, and by 1995 it will exceed 60 percent. As early as 1990 the beginning of conversion is scheduled at one-half of the enterprises of the defense complex. These are, we might say, the main parameters of the state conversion plan whose development is to be completed in the fourth quarter of this year.

The plan is still being developed, but actually conversion has already begun. For example, in 1989 the output of military materiel will amount to 95.5 percent of last year's level whereas earlier it was supposed to grow by 5.5 percent. On the other hand, the output of civilian products will increase this year by 8.9 percent (an increase by 5.7 percent was planned). Next year 13 percent more civilian products will be manufactured than this year, and over 30 percent more consumer goods.

The following statistic is also interesting: Even now the defense complex produces about 22 percent of all nonfood consumer goods manufactured in our country (excluding the products of light industry). Among them are 100 percent of TV sets, video cassette recorders, sewing machines, and radios, over 97 percent of the refrigerators, and over one-half of the motorcycles. It is planned that in 1990 the defense complex will increase the output of, say, washing machines by 36 percent, vacuum cleaners by 25 percent, and the output of TV sets will exceed 11 million units. Of course, in the process subcontractors will have to ensure corresponding increments in the deliveries of materials and subcontracted products for the enterprises of the defense complex which are increasing the output of peaceful products. Thus far, as the reports received by

PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK suggest, there are not enough subcontracted products even for the current volume of production.

Priority avenues for using the production potential released from military orders include the production of equipment for the agroindustrial complex, light industry, and trade and public catering; the manufacture of consumer goods; the production of electronic, computer, and medical equipment; and civilian aircraft production and shipbuilding. It is planned to double the production of technological equipment for the agroindustrial complex in the next 5-year plan. In 1995 R3.8 billion worth will be turned out—82 percent of the total produced in the country. It is envisaged that in 1995 the defense complex will produce R2.3 billion worth of technological equipment for light industry, or 87 percent of the all-union volume. The picture is the same on other priority avenues mentioned above.

[Boxed material: For your information: Production of sophisticated household appliances will attain the following level in 1995:

TV sets—15 million (increment of 34.2 percent compared to the 1990 level), including color TV sets—12 million (increment of 62.6 percent); refrigerators—9 million (increment of 32.4 percent); sewing machines—3.5 million (increment of 84.2 percent); washing machines—7.2 million (increment of 21.5 percent); electric vacuum cleaners—7.0 million (increment of 32.1 percent); video cassette recorders—2.3 million (growth by a factor of 5.1); engine units and motorized cultivators—660,000 (growth by a factor of 2.6).]

There is the opinion that "defense" may and should participate in carrying out virtually all programs of social and economic development. However, there are at least two reasons why this cannot be done.

First, it would be strange if enterprises with a high standard of production which have rich technical and technological experience were to use this unique potential in order to, say, design and manufacture gardening tools for members of second-home cooperatives.

Second, the potential of the defense complex is not unlimited. For example, the value of its fixed assets amounts to only 6 percent of the value of production assets of the national economy as a whole.

The participation of the defense complex in accomplishing a broader scope of tasks will call for a resolute renewal and modernization of the fixed assets. However, the tight financial situation in our country simply does not make this possible. After all, as reports from TASS correspondents show, employees are concerned about the shortage of funds for renewing and reconstructing fixed assets even at the enterprises which are to undergo conversion in the immediate future. Meanwhile, more difficult tasks are still in store for us.

In a word, major capital investment and corresponding material and technical supplies are necessary for changes in production lines, technological equipment, and preparations for new production at the enterprises converted. The amounts of such funds and resources are now being calculated by the ministries jointly with the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]; they will be specified in the draft plan of conversion of military production.

Even preliminary studies indicate that a substantial share of the funds to be released as a result of conversion must be spent to restructure the technology, redo the rigging and instrumentation, prepare production again, and retrain cadres. Additional difficulties are entailed in the fact that on the whole it is envisaged to accomplish the shifts in the facilities of the defense industries without suspending production. This is one of the most complex issues. Of course, at enterprises such as the Leninskaya Kuznitsa Plant this transition is going to be less painful. On the other hand, the Yuryuzan Mechanical Plant has experienced and apparently is still experiencing considerable difficulties due to the slow pace of construction.

However, it is obviously necessary to invite the attention of the ministries and offices of our country's national economy and the USSR Ministry of Defense to using the equipment released in conjunction with reducing the army more efficiently.

Increasing the output of peaceful products also requires that additional funds be found for compensating the inevitable losses in salaries; employees of defense enterprises which have embarked on conversion bring this up in a frank manner. The funds for economic incentives should be maintained at the previous levels. Otherwise, they stand to lose skilled cadres. This is why the State Military Industrial Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers intends to prepare along with the conversion plan a number of proposals on the issues of job placement of the employees of defense industries, their retraining and procedures for remunerations during this period, and assignment of retirement benefits.

Rational utilization of the research potential of defense industries is extremely important. It is envisaged that the capacity of scientific research and experimental-design facilities released from developing weapons will be maintained, certainly with the direction of their operations changed. As early as this year, 250 technological processes and 130 types of advanced equipment are to be transferred to civilian industries. However, such work needs to be made systematic: Control over the technology transfer must be established, and the issues of incentives for both sides need to be considered. It is expected that outlays for scientific-research and experimental-design work in civilian areas (budget of the ministries, contracts with customers, own sources, and so on) will increase by 4 percent a year on the average in the 13th 5-Year Plan. This is no longer the notorious residual principle which has been "hobbling" the creation of new civilian products and consumer goods for many years.

Last but not least, maintaining the level of defense sufficiency and ensuring a high scientific and technical standard of the military materiel produced remains the most significant task.

Military

Akhromeyev Says Arms Spending Cuts Necessary

LD0110120189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1131 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Oct (TASS)—The reduction of Soviet military expenditure in 1990 by R6.4 billion is possible and necessary, thinks Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, USSR People's Deputy. This step is in accordance with the policy of peace and reducing military tension being pursued by the USSR, he noted in a conversation with TASS Parliamentary Correspondent Valeriy Kiosa. At the same time, the marshal stressed, the ongoing military threat compels the USSR to maintain its defensive capability at the necessary level.

The adviser to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet recalled that the country's draft budget for next year envisages reducing military expenditure from R77.3 billion to R70.9 billion in 1989. Marshal Akhromeyev does not rule out the possibility that during discussion in the committees and commissions, deputies will call for a still greater reduction in defense spending.

For his part, he considers the military expenditure for 1990 proposed by the government to be carefully thought out. As he put it, these proposals take into consideration reducing the Soviet armed forces by 500,000 people, while at the same time satisfying minimum defense requirements.

Touching on the conversion in the military industry, Marshal Akhromeyev said that a detailed plan will be presented to the Soviet Parliament at the end of this year. He noted that whereas in 1988 civilian production accounted for 40 percent of the overall range of military industry output, by 1995 this figure should rise to 60 percent. As soon as next year, the production of consumer goods in this sphere of the Soviet economy will increase to R10.1 billion. It is planned to significantly increase the production of medical equipment and equipment for light industry, the agroindustrial complex, and trade. Civil aviation is to acquire the new IL-96-300, TU-204, and IL-114 planes in the near future.

Speaking about the possibility of the appearance of a professional army in the USSR, Marshal Akhromeyev said that this could not be done today for two reasons. Firstly, in the present situation, manning the army on the basis of universal military service makes it possible to have trained, mobilized resources, and to provide for their use in the event of an acute exacerbation of the situation. Secondly, a professional army requires far greater material resources and financial means which cannot be found under the present economic situation.

KGB Cuts Central Military Counterintelligence

LD0410100489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0805 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Oct (TASS)—The USSR KGB is conducting organizational and staffing changes in military counterintelligence bodies. The 'PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK (GOVERNMENT HERALD)' notes today that this is connected with reductions in the numerical strength of the Soviet armed forces.

The strength of the central apparatus of military counterintelligence has been reduced by more than 10 percent. More than 20 military counterintelligence bodies in strategic and tactical formations of the USSR armed forces have been abolished. At present the attention of military counterintelligence employees is focused on raising the professional level of counterintelligence security for the troops and naval forces, and on extending cooperation with the military commands and political bodies of the army and the navy.

Released personnel are being directed to subunits dealing with the struggle against organized crime.

Referring to data provided by Lieutenant General V.S. Sergeyev, member of the USSR KGB Collegium, 'PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK' writes that over the last few years military counterintelligence bodies, which are a component part of the national KGB, together with local KGB bodies, have cut short a number of major intelligence and subversive operations by foreign special services. Several foreign intelligence agents acting against the USSR armed forces have been exposed. Proceeding from their main purpose—which is to ensure state security in the army and the navy and to make the utmost contribution toward raising their combat readiness—at present military counterintelligence bodies are solving the following principal tasks: Uncovering and cutting short intelligence and subversive activities by foreign intelligence services, as well as criminal actions by hostile elements, directed at weakening the fighting strength of the Soviet armed forces; investigation of criminal cases concerning state offenses which the law places within the powers of state security bodies; participation in work directed at raising the political vigilance of servicemen and manual laborers and office workers.

Great significance is attached to preventive work to avert state offenses and other antisocial activities which could damage the operational efficiency of the USSR armed forces. At the same time special attention is paid to rigorous observance of the socialist law.

The adopted decision on organizational and staffing changes in the military counterintelligence bodies is a concrete manifestation of the USSR KGB course in restructuring operational and service activities of its employees, emphasizes the 'PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK.'

Reorganization of Komsomol Army Structure Proposed

PM0310141989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Major A. Kovalev report: "Along the Path of Renewal"]

[Text] A 2-day conference of the Army and Navy Communist Youth League [Komsomol] aktiv was held in the M.V. Frunze Central House of the Soviet Army in Moscow 29-30 September.

The Armed Forces Komsomol is evidently on the threshold of an important renewal of its organizational structure and fundamental changes in the content of its activity.

This is the conclusion to be drawn from an analysis of the work of the Army and Navy Komsomol aktiv's conference. It is hard to recall any other event where such an acutely polemical atmosphere prevailed or where the problems facing Army and Navy Komsomol organizations were discussed in such a principled fashion.

The report by Lieutenant Colonel I. Yefimov, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate for Komsomol work, and the speeches by Captain I. Zhakevich, Major A. Shcherbina, Lieutenant Colonel A. Kanshin, Lieutenant Captain I. Shulgin, Sergeant K. Tikhonov, Cadet N. Radchenko, and other conference participants noted that the accumulated problems can be solved and the Komsomol's prestige boosted only along the path of further development of Komsomol organizations' autonomy and the emancipation of their creative opportunities and initiative.

A real basis for this can be provided by the formation of elected Komsomol leadership organs under the political organs, right up to the Main Political Directorate. What should they be called? Councils, maybe. Komsomol organization councils under large units' political departments and the political directorates of military districts, groups of forces, and fleets, and under the political directorates of Armed Forces branches and troop categories. And under the Main Political Directorate—an All-Army Council of the Armed Forces Komsomol Organization. The councils elect their own chairmen, who will then be appointed simultaneously as assistants to the political organ chief for Komsomol work.

All this, in the conference participants' opinion, will make it possible to implement, not in words but in deed, party leadership of the Komsomol by political methods rather than by means of tutelage.

It will also enhance the responsibility of Komsomol officials, because they will be accountable for their actions and deeds to the young people's collective which nominated and elected them.

In addition, the creation of the councils will enable the Armed Forces Komsomol organization to acquire the status and rights of a republic Komsomol organization.

Of course, all these proposals for organizational perestroyka still require thorough working out, since it is too early to say how usefully and efficiently the new Komsomol organs could operate. Only practice, only life can answer this.

The conference also discussed questions associated with preparations for the 21st Komsomol Congress. A working group was set up to generalize Komsomol members' proposals regarding the draft Komsomol Statutes and Program.

The conference participants adopted an address to the Komsomol Central Committee, which will be published.

The conference was addressed by Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and V. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee.

N. Shlyaga, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee subdepartment, took part in the conference's work.